FBIS DAILY REPORT

CONTENTS

Soviet Union

Vol III No 194 *7 October 1985*

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

ARMS CONTROL & DISARMAMENT

Reagan Stand on Arms Offers Termed 'Pretty Facade' [Bogachev] AA 1
U.S. Brochure on Space Defense Criticized AA 2
Contents Labeled 'Fabrication' AA 2
Chernyshev Disputes Findings AA 2
U.S. Continues Testing of Space Strike Weapons AA 4
Mutual Military Notification Proposal Made at CDE [AFP] AA 4
U.S. Strategic Doctrines Encourage Arms Escalations [Gudkov in NEW TIMES No 38 Sep] AA 5
Chemical Deployment Plans Mark New Phase in Arms Race AA 10

WORLD & REGIONAL ISSUES

Weekly 'International Observers Roundtable' CC 1

UNITED STATES & CANADA

Shultz Threatens Military Action Against Nicaragua A 1
Pell Appointed To Head USIA Radio Stations A 1
Soviet-Canadian Agriculture Talks Open in Moscow A 1
Nuriyev Meets With Delegation A 2
Nikonov Meets Delegation Head A 2

SOUTHEAST ASIA & PACIFIC

Economic Talks Held With Cambodian Officials E 1
Anniversary of Relations With Laos Noted E 1

WESTERN EUROPE

Further Reportage on Gorbachev Visit G 1
Joint Press Conference Held G 1
Gorbachev Statement, Interview [PRAVDA 6 Oct] G 1
Moscow TV Coverage G 11
Visits Peugeot Plant G 24
Greets PCF at Lenin Museum G 24
Gorbachev Hosts Dinner 4 Oct G 25
Gorbachev Dinner Speech G 25
Mitterrand Dinner Speech G 27
Meets PCF's Marchais 5 Oct G 29

MIDDLE EAST & NORTH AFRICA

Further Reportage, Statements on Beirut Hostages H 1
New Conditions for Release H 1
[Paris Radio Monte Carlo]
Birri Meets Soviet Envoy [Beirut] H 1
Moscow TV Review H 1
Defense Measures Discussed H 2
Youth Group Statement H 2
Red Cross Statement H 3
Embassy Statement [Beirut] H 3
Tunisia Severs Diplomatic Links With Libya H 3
[PRAVDA 28 Sep]
U.S. Uses Arms Deliveries To 'Pressure' Jordan H 4
[IZVESTIYA 1 Oct]
UN Members Speak Out Against Israeli Actions H 4

LATIN AMERICA & CARIBBEAN

Castro, Nyerere Hold Talks in Havana K 1
State of Siege Continues in Bolivia K 1
Demichev Receives Argentine Culture Minister K 2
CPSU Delegation Returns from Jamaica K 2
Tolkunov Meets with Surinamese Official K 2

NATIONAL AFFAIRS

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENTS

Academician Comments on Incentives for Quality S 1
[PRAVDA 2 Oct]

REAGAN STAND ON ARMS OFFERS TERMED 'PRETTY FACADE'

LD041812 Moscow TASS in English 1752 GMT 4 Oct 85

["Facts and Fancies" -- TASS headline]

[Text] Moscow, October 4 TASS -- TASS military news analyst Vladimir Bogachev writes:

The President of the United States contends that a ballistic missile can be slung over one's shoulder like a hunting gun and simply driven 'up into the Urals mountains" almost within a matter of hours. To be more precise, for reasons one can guess Reagan ascribes such a supernatural mobility to Soviet ballistic missiles.

When replying on Thursday in Ohio to questions by newsmen about the speech made by the Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev to member of the French Parliament, the President of the United States said that the withdrawal from standby alert of Soviet SS-20 missiles in Europe that were additionally deployed after July 1984 supposedly "made no sense" since these missiles are mobile ones and "can move from place to place".

But as the Supreme Commander in chief of the United States Armed Forces Reagan should know that a missile, even if a mobile one, needs rather sophisticated permanent, that is non-mobile installations, the setting up of which takes time. For instance, before moving American Pershing-2 missiles and cruise missiles to Western Europe the Pentagon had to engage in labour-intensive work to create the necessary infrastructure for its mobile delivery vehicles. The British can confirm, for instance, that more than a day and more than a week were needed to set up the base for American cruise missiles at Greenham Common. The President should also know that the national technical means of the Soviet Union and of the United States easily detect such work carried out by the other side. In other words, this is verifiable.

If the geographical location of mobile medium range nuclear missiles is not important, as Reagan contends, why does the Pentagon not order the withdrawal from standby alert of the American nuclear missiles in Western Europe and the dismantling of the relevant permanent installations in Britain, West Germany, Italy and Belgium. Unfortunately Reagan did not even hint at the possibility of such reply measures to the Soviet Union's peace initiative.

It appears that the American President's statement concerning the Soviet Union's important practical measure to normalise the military-political situation in Europe had one aim -- to try to put a pretty facade on Washington's obstructionist stand on problems of disarmament, or at least to apply some cosmetics to it.

The Soviet Union now has much fewer medium range carrier rockets capable of reaching targets on the territory of Western Europe than ten or even fifteen years ago. By deciding to withdraw from standby alert the Soviet missiles that were additionally deployed after July 1984 in response to the deployment of American medium range missiles in Europe, and also to dismantle in the coming two months the permanent installations for these Soviet missiles, the Soviet Union imposed considerable limitations upon itself proceeding from the broad interests of European security. Europe now is right in expecting a reply step by the United States -- the termination of the further deployment by it of its medium-range missiles on the European Continent.

It would be gratifying to hope that reason will finally take the upper hand in the United States Administration.

U.S. BROCHURE ON SPACE DEFENSE CRITICIZED

Contents Labeled 'Fabrication'

LD051132 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0312 GMT 5 Oct 85

[Text] Washington, 5 Oct (TASS) -- TASS correspondent Alexandr Lyutyy reports:

Official Washington has once again resorted to crude lies in an attempt to justify its dangerous plans for militarizing space. At a news conference held here, a brochure entitled "Soviet Programs in the Area of Strategic Defense," jointly prepared by the Pentagon and the State Department, was distributed with great pomp. The brochure is nothing more than a fabrication put together by administration disinformation specialists. It claims groundlessly that the Soviet Union is carrying out a broad program of offensive space weapons development [razrabotka] and that the administration's famous "Strategic Defense Initiative" is a "sensible and essential response" by the United States to similar activity.

The brochure's creators are not afraid of even the most brazen distortion of the facts, nor of slander. They go as far as to claim that Soviet military doctrine envisages the creation [sozdaniye] of a first-strike potential and that the USSR may try to resort to "nuclear blackmail." Speaking at the news conference in connection with the brochure's appearance, Paul Nitze, special presidential advisor and state secretary for arms limitation and Richard Perle, assistant defense secretary, held forth about the Soviet Union's "violation" of the 1972 ABM Treaty.

The administration is in need of all these lies to attempt to, in the eyes of the public, once more justify the arms race on earth, which is being stepped up by the United States, and Washington's stubborn efforts to extend it into space.

Thus, Defense Secretary C. Weinberger and Secretary of State G. Shultz, in a jointly written preface to the brochure, insist upon continuing the modernization of the U.S. nuclear potential, and also pushing through work in the field of the "Strategic Defense Initiative."

As the UPI news agency writes, the brochure's appearance "is to all appearances linked" with the introduction of the Soviet Union's latest peaceful initiatives. Washington has obviously set itself the aim of putting the USSR's constructive steps, which are aimed at curbing the arms race, in a negative light with the help of a dirty lie.

Chernyshev Disputes Findings

LD052034 Moscow TASS in English 1945 GMT 5 Oct 85

[Text] Moscow, October 5 TASS -- TASS military news analyst Vladimir Chernyshev writes:

The stronger voices of protest sound in the world against the "star wars" programme conceived and implemented by Washington, the more practical steps and initiatives come from the Soviet Union with the aim of creating a favourable atmosphere for the attainment of positive accords at the approaching Soviet-America summit, the more often one hears a stubborn "no" from the United States. All sorts of reports, "studies", booklets and other fabrications with eye-catching titles and claiming to be "scientific" pursue the aim of playing down the role and importance of the USSR's striving for peace and at the same time to whitewash the American Administration's plans that threaten mankind.

The Pentagon together with the State Department have just put out a booklet purportedly about Soviet programmes in the field of strategic defence. A glossy cover, 27 pages of text, diagrams and drawings. It looks pretty, but when you start reading this so to say "study" you feel soiled by every single page. The only element of truth in it is Washington's intent to create space strike arms at all cost and to carry out its "star wars" programme. And this obsessive striving totally deprives the authors of an elementary sense of logic and the natural fear of appearing ridiculous.

Take, for instance, the foreword to the booklet signed by Secretary of Defence Caspar Weinberger and Secretary of State George Shultz. They write that the "Strategic Defense Initiative" is the most expedient and necessary answer, a reaction to the Soviet Union's big effort in the field of ABM defences. But what about President Ronald Reagan's authorship of "star wars"? for the head of the White House constantly stresses that it was his idea, that he is the "father" of "star wars", even though he prefers to call his brainchild the "Strategic Defence Initiative". It was for good reason that this "slight" to the initiator was immediately noticed by the Western mass media.

The attempts of the United States to convince the world public that the Soviet Union is implementing a "star wars" programme contradict President Reagan's statements who lauded the "star wars" plan as a potential means of saving mankind from the threat of nuclear war, wrote the British newspaper GUARDIAN.

The Soviet Union, as it has been repeatedly stated at the highest level, is not creating space strike weapons and an ABM defence of the territory of the country and has never tried to dispute the American "claim" to inventing "star wars". On the contrary, it is consistently and firmly coming out for preventing any steps to militarise outer space and is calling on the United States to formalise this in a treaty. But to this day Washington refuses to heed the voice of reason.

The authors of the booklet go so far as to contend that the USSR perhaps is preparing an ABM system for its entire national territory, and that while the American "star wars" should result in a destruction of nuclear arms the mythical Soviet developments pose a serious threat to the West. Indeed, there is no limit to cynicism and falsehoods.

Other statements in the booklet are also surprising, to put it mildly. According to them the SDI is a reaction to the deployment by the Russians of a system allowed by the ABM Treaty. It appears that the American "researchers" are trying to prove what cannot be proved.

Indeed, how can a sane person contend that the creation in the United States of space strike arms that are prohibited by the ABM Treaty is an expedient and necessary answer to what is allowed by the treaty? And what is the worth of the contention that the SDI is a factor preventing the Russians from adopting a decision to build up their ABM potential? It follows from this that not the prohibition of the development and deployment of space strike arms, as is called for by the USSR, but the big effort on the part of the United States to implement the "star wars" programme should be regarded as a factor helping to keep the arms race in check. It is difficult to imagine a more absurd "logic".

But the main conclusion drawn by Weinberger and Shultz crosses the t's and dots the i's. They write that the United States must modernise its offensive nuclear arms and develop a reliable ABM system. This is the thought that the authors of the booklet want the reader to accept.

The other aim is to ascribe to the Soviet Union everything for which the world public is long criticising the United States Administration.

For this reason it is announced that the USSR supposedly is conducting extensive research with the aim of creating laser and particle beam arms, that the USSR has the world's only operative anti-satellite weapons system, that the USSR violates the AMB Treaty, and so on.

But the whole world knows that these are American sins. That it is the United States which is not only developing but also testing laser and particle beam weapons. That it is exactly the United States that is developing and testing in space anti-satellite arms of the second generation. That it is exactly the United States that is violating the ABM Treaty by setting itself the aim of creating a large-scale ABM system with elements of space basing, by developing mobile ABM radars, by testing "Minuteman" missiles to impart to them an anti-missile capability, by deploying "Pave Paws" radars to cover the territory of the United States, and by carrying out other programmes.

All this shows that with the direct participation of the State Department the Pentagon is working to wreck the existing international agreements that "impede" Washington's militaristic course and striving by means of other space strike arms to secure strategic military superiority over the Soviet Union, while at the same time trying to delude the world public by using outright slander against the USSR as a "substantiation" of its actions.

U.S. CONTINUES TESTING OF SPACE STRIKE WEAPONS

LD041746 Moscow TASS in English 0755 GMT 4 Oct 85

[Text] Washington, October 4 TASS -- A new test has been carried out in the United States within the framework of the programme for the creation of space strike weapons. A Pentagon spokesman has said that the beam of a ground-based laser installation tracked a rocket which was launched from the U.S. Navy test range at Hawaii islands. According to the Pentagon, it is the first time a laser beam, adjusted for atmosphere distortion, has been propagated from the ground to space. The experiment with the use of a laser installation is yet another evidence that the Pentagon has already started testing components of a large-scale anti-missile defence system with space-based elements.

MUTUAL MILITARY NOTIFICATION PROPOSAL MADE AT CDE

AU041808 Paris AFP in English 1759 GMT 4 Oct 85

[Text] Stockholm, Oct 4 (AFP) -- The Soviet Union is willing to participate in mutual notification of military activities in order to reduce the risks of conflict in Europe, the Soviet delegate to the Conference on Disarmament in Europe (CDE) here said today according to a diplomatic source.

Oleg Grinevskiy was responding to measures proposed here by Western and neutral countries.

Mr. Grinevskiy thus continued the "peace offensive" Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev is waging in Paris, where he has proposed a 50 per cent reduction in U.S. and Soviet strategic weapons and direct talks between the Soviet Union and Western European nuclear powers France and Britain.

Mr. Grinevskiy went too far, however, according to Western delegates, in proposing that air and naval maneuvers be included in the "calendars" to be exchanged, the source said.

The Western delegates feel that the CDE mandate only covers land, and possibly amphibious, operations.

U.S. STRATEGIC DOCTRINES ENCOURAGE ARMS ESCALATION

PM251508 Moscow NEW TIMES in English No 38, Sep 85 pp 3-5

[Yuriy Gudkov article: "False Promises and the Nuclear Reality"]

[Text] The report was brief, somewhat ambiguous and two months late. The papers reported "an important advance in the development of an X-ray laser space weapons."

If the information available is true, it refers to the first practical result the Livermore National Laboratory (California) has achieved in its top secret research on the focussing of X-rays. "The new device," THE NEW YORK TIMES writes, "channels the power of a nuclear explosion into laser rods that emit powerful bursts of radiation before the whole device is consumed in a giant fireball."

Over a period of several decades the Livermore National Laboratory headed by Edward Teller, father of the U.S. hydrogen bomb, has been, perhaps, the main supplier of ideas and designs for the latest in strategic weaponry. As far as this device is concerned, it was named Excalibur after the sword King Arthur, according to legend, drew out of a miraculous stone. The new version known as Super Excalibur has been tested in Nevada. It is regarded as a most promising weapon in the "star wars" programme. Only it was not drawn from a stone, but from a nuclear blast. This is the gist of the "secret" that has created a rather awkward problem for official Washington.

When a group of America's most eminent scientists finally got the President to receive them to tell him they disagreed with the Strategic Defence Initiative he several times repeated that the USA had started research in non-nuclear defense against a nuclear attack.

The term "non-nuclear defence" bears a meaningful message. Indeed, defence is not attack. The side in defence not only exercises a lawful right to defence and to the strengthening of its defences, but also cannot be suspected of aggressive intentions. On the other hand, "non-nuclear defense" implies that the "star wars" programme will ultimately result in the abandonment of the nuclear weapon. It follows that the programme takes account of the dangerous realities of the nuclear age.

The scientists did not agree with this argument, and duly informed newsmen after the audience. The reason for this is their competence. As experts they are well aware of the danger arising from the abandonment of the present security system based on an approximate parity of strength, and from the "weaponry of the future" as such. As for the public, the situation is totally different. As a rule, the public does not know the facts. It is offered biased interpretation of these facts or simply lies for the "sake of national security," as is usually the case. The nuclear stuffing of Super Excalibur creates difficulties, because it gives food for thought and betrays the true purpose of the programme even to the uninitiated. After all it is not impossible to reconstruct a dinosaur from the end of its tail.

The official silence and reticence are highly significant. The point is that Washington has tried to persuade U.S. and world public opinion that the "star wars" programme means salvation, that it is a sweeping, though costly, but practicable solution to the dilemma that threatens the world with total disaster as nuclear weapon stockpiles accumulate.

Torrents of Words

Washington's campaign to promote SDI is unprecedented with respect to its forcefulness, duration and the personalities involved. If official assertions are true, "star wars" is an abstraction-a promise of a distant millennium when," as NEWSWEEK ironically remarked, "nuclear weapons will no longer exist, a piece on the global chessboard, a budget line." The exaggeration is not too great here. The promises do indeed take your breath away, if, of course, you turn your back on reality.

The term "star wars" went into circulation practically the day after the President delivered his speech on March 23, 1983. It was borrowed from the film of the same name, which imaginatively presents war in space. The President was hurt. He said he wanted the person who had coined the expression to take it back, because it misrepresented what he had in mind.

What did he have in mind?

As the President put it, he was averse to "a certain immorality" in the strategy of guaranteed mutual destruction. He gave the gist of the strategy as follows:

"If you blow our people up, we'll blow your people up." It would be appropriate to recall that it was Washington that produced the concept and elaborated it in detail. Hence the question: "Isn't it worth it to see if we can't come up with a non-nuclear weapon that won't destroy people, will prevent those weapons from reaching their targets?"

The U.S. secretary of defence paints the following picture: "If we have ours ready, then SDI may eventually provide mankind with the means to a safer basis for deterring aggression and ensuring world stability." Moreover, "the very process of achieving strategic defence could be a key step on the path to greater political cooperation and a reduction in East-West antagonism."

Paul Nitze, the President's adviser for arms limitation talks, has said that in the next ten years the aim of the United States would be radically to reduce the stockpiles of existing and planned offensive nuclear weapons and to stabilize the balance between offensive and defensive nuclear weapons, whether on the ground or in space. The ultimate goal would be to free the world of nuclear weapons.

These statements account for only a small share of the torrents of words inundating both sides of the Atlantic. Not only a new name, "Strategic Defence Initiative," but also a complete system of arguments have been worked out. And it is all based on people's dream of a secure world, better mutual understanding, and delivery from nuclear weapons. The very idea of the "shield" was prompted by the understandable desire to cherish such a possibility. Though promises of a "golden age" have invariably produced sceptics, they have also won crowds of supporters. Public opinion polls have always shown that many Americans take for granted what official Washington says.

Of course, this is not the first instance of deliberate deception. A special jargon has even taken shape. The propaganda backup to every intention is referred to as "declarative," as distinguished from practical policy, because, unless it is camouflaged, the latter is considered to be totally unacceptable to the public. In a contribution to THE LOS ANGELES TIMES Thomas S. Powers writes that "explaining defence to the people in a democracy is a bit like explaining love or money to children in a family -- you do not want to lie exactly but the whole truth seems a little raw for innocent ears."

Thomas S. Powers happens to be a "sceptic." Not because he is distrustful by nature, but because of his professional involvement. He studies weapon systems and strategic concepts for their use. His final conclusion is: "The secret of 'star wars' is that it is intended to defend weapons, not people. The purpose is not to keep the Soviets from threatening us, but to make sure we can threaten them."

Let us bear this in mind while examining real, and not declarative, policy.

"Another Course"

In 1972 the USSR and the USA signed a treaty which stipulated that both sides abandon the idea of strategic defence. During the presidential campaign in 1980 Ronald Reagan as a nominee opposed the doctrine of mutual assured destruction which essentially recognized a reality that was new to the USA, namely the parity the two sides had achieved in their nuclear strength. He presented the case as being simply common sense. To make his point he cited the example of two people poking pistols at each other's heads. He has never tired of reiterating that there must be another course. If the United States were to proceed from the commitments it had assumed under the terms of the 1972 treaty, the only course open was to conduct arms limitation talks.

However, "another course" the President proposed was "strategic defence."

Though very few people noticed it, in its 1980 platform the Republican Party pressed for "vigorous research and development of an effective anti-ballistic missile system." In November 1980 the first *X*-ray laser test was conducted in the Nevada desert under the code name Dauphin. It was held in deep secrecy. Despite this, less than three months later AVIATION WEEK & SPACE TECHNOLOGY carried a detailed description and a concluding proposal: "The X-ray lasers based on the successful Dauphin test, when mounted in a laser battle station, are so small that a single payload bay on the space shuttle could carry to orbit a number sufficient to stop a Soviet nuclear-weapons attack."

Several months later a group of scientists, brass hats, business people, and executives of aerospace corporations met on the premises of the Heritage Foundation, an ultra-conservative organization. In May 1981 George A. Keyworth, a nuclear physicist, was appointed the President's science adviser.

The members of the group first visited the White House in January 1982. Another meeting took place early in the following year. It was then, on January 14, that George A. Keyworth broke the official silence by referring to the work on the X-ray laser as "one of the most important programmes that may seriously influence the nation's defence posture in the next decades."

Modernization of the Armed Forces was being vigorously advanced on the basis of programmes Congress had endorsed and long-term appropriations that were to guarantee it in the 1980's and 1990's. Meanwhile new factors made themselves felt. The protracted and exhausting battles fought in Congress over the MX missile and the painful doubts about the Midgetman system are proof positive that it is becoming increasingly difficult to explain to and defend before public opinion the endless stockpiling of nuclear missiles. The fact that there are enough weapons to destroy life on earth, if not the earth itself, many times over makes further nuclear arms race pointless. No wonder the Joint Chiefs of Staff said that the MX was probably the last missile this Congress is ever going to go for. The conclusion the Joint Chiefs of Staff have drawn is that "we've got to look beyond MX." The question is where.

It was here that the other factor was brought into effect. It was proposed to develop an anti-missile weapon, or a weapon of the third generation, as it is called.

This was a conspiracy against the policy of looking for a way out through talks and not through projects developed in the secret laboratories of the military-industrial complex. It can also be seen as a conspiracy against humanity.

Those Opting For

The Livermore National Laboratory is not the only one of its kind. The Los Alamos Scientific Laboratory is equally famous. Then there is Sigma Tau, a laser development centre belonging to the Rockwell International near Los Angeles. Over a period of many years the Grumman Corporation has been working on space-based radar stations in Bethpage, New York. Since the 1960's the Martin-Marietta Aerospace Co. of Orlando, Florida, has been working on anti-missile interceptors and "intelligent" missiles. Finally, there are Boeing, TRW, IBM, Honeywell, and many other firms.

The vice-president of Rocketdyne Inc., a Los Angeles subsidiary of the Rockwell International, says the "star wars" programme did not come as a surprise to them. This is not an admission, but a mere statement of a fact that was concealed from the public till the time was ripe for it.

This is not the first time that doctrines and strategic concepts have been revised under the pressure of technological developments, and not of circumstances. The military-industrial monopolies are behind them. As far as they are concerned, these developments mean tenders for more government contracts and for more billions of dollars in profits. The military appropriations having surpassed the $300 billion margin, the stakes are fabulously high. Through the Pentagon the munitions corporations get the lion's share of the national budget. However, their main concern is not merely to preserve this share, but to increase it with every passing year. The supply of new hardware is justification for their claims.

At present the scope of these claims is indeed boundless and is not likely to diminish for decades to come. In scope the Strategic Defence Initiative can be compared with the nuclear-missile race started 40 years ago and still going on.

Chain of Consequences

However, those who daydream about a "shield" repelling and rendering useless nuclear missiles should know that at best it will really be no more than an umbrella full of holes. Even the Americans cannot conceal this. Lieutenant-General James Abrahamson, the "star wars" programme supervisor, says that "a perfect defence is not a realistic thing." Harold Brown, ex-Secretary of Defence who happens to be a nuclear physicist, considers the chances of creating a "perfect or near-perfect defence negligibly low." Ronald Reagan had remarked that he had never demanded that strategic defence should be one hundred per cent foolproof.

A whole chain of consequences follows from here, which reveal the essence of the intention. Above all the "discarding" of nuclear weapons is out of the question: If the Teller laser implies the use of a nuclear explosion in the new weapon system, an unreliable "shield" will mean that the "sword" -- the nuclear-missile strength -- will have to be retained and advanced. Contradicting himself, but not the intention, Caspar Weinberger says in plain language they are not going to stop modernizing the existing strategic arms.

In this context the U.S. position at the Geneva talks is significant. While refusing to discuss space weaponry, it demands that the USSR should reduce its strategic missile potential. This will, naturally, make it easier for the "shield" makers. As James Fletcher, chairman of an administration panel for the examination of the SDI's technical prospects, said "the ultimate utility...of this system will depend not only on the technology itself, but on the extent to which the Soviet Union agrees to mutual defence arrangements and offence limitations." Here the indissoluble link between defensive and offensive arms leaps to the eye. It explains the USSR's position at the talks. Mikhail Gorbachev put it in very clear terms: "Unless the arms race in space is prevented, there will be nothing at all."

Though this sort of defence will not afford adequate protection against a massive first attack, it might prove helpful in beating off a retaliatory blow dealt by an enemy already weakened by a first attack.

Even if the offensive forces are equal, these circles hope the "shield" will offer them an advantage that will enable them to threaten the other side with nuclear war or even unleash it. That is why the character of "strategic defence" is so provocative. No wonder that in an interview he gave Ronald Reagan admitted that any defence system combined with offensive arms might be regarded as a factor contributing to aggressive policies.

It follows from this that "strategic defence" is intended to pave the way for nuclear war and help find a means for unleashing it, instead of building the "shield" some people would perhaps, like to have faith in.

It is necessary to take account of yet another circumstance. All these moves fit in with the policy Washington has been pursuing over the entire postwar period. It was inaugurated in Hiroshima and Nagasaki when the United States committed itself to nuclear superiority as a means of achieving its objectives. Ever since the position of strength in its nuclear version has constituted an organic element of U.S. policy. Two plans, Halfmoon and Dropshot, that the Joint Chiefs of Staff produced provided for massive employment of the atomic weapon. Of course, they counted on impunity. When the USA's nuclear monopoly ended, these calculations proved impracticable. However, this did not cause the USA to abandon the idea of employing the nuclear weapon. A flexible response strategy and the concept of local nuclear war were devised. The assumption was that superiority in nuclear strength would enable the United States to threaten other countries with total war and thus give it a free hand in pursuing its policies.

Parity in strategic weapons brought about further changes. Hopes to secure and retain superiority by quantitative stockpiling of nuclear weapons did not materialize. In a statement signed in Vladivostock in 1974 the USA recognized the principle of equality and equal security. However, subsequent events have shown that the USA had not given up the drive for superiority. Only now it has been switched to the qualitative improvement of weaponry.

Among the weapons now available are missiles equipped with multiple independently targetable re-entry vehicles, Trident missiles which are supposed to make sea-based nuclear missiles as accurate as the ground-based weapons, cruise missiles, which cannot be detected by radar, and Stealth, a bomber of the new generation. Let us recall that the USA has developed the neutron weapon and deployed intermediate-range ballistic missiles in Western Europe to upset strategic parity. And, finally, take the plans to equip NATO ground forces with the latest means of detection, combat control and destruction. Such anti-missile systems as Nike-Zeus, then the Nike-X, Defender, Sentinel and Safeguard were developed in the hope of a technological breakthrough.

The "star wars" programme is the biggest and most dangerous of these undertakings. Having been launched in defiance of existing agreements, it provides for a total mobilization of scientific manpower, technological facilities, and material and financial resources. When Washington compares "strategic defence" with the Manhattan (atom bomb) and Apollo (sending a crew to the moon) projects, it wants to show that concentrated effort can produce practical results in the foreseeable future. Only instead of ushering in a "golden age" it will start another round in the arms race designed to assure U.S. military superiority and the possibility of unleashing nuclear war.

That is precisely why it is so important and urgent to realize this danger, to see through the carefully thought-out broad-based campaign of deliberate deception and to counter it. The Soviet initiatives offer practical possibilities of search for a solution. Mikhail Gorbachev has made it clear that "our proposals have been made in earnest." But Washington has responded to them with a nuclear test in Nevada and the announcement of the first anti-satellite weapon test carried out against a target in space. As THE WASHINGTON POST has pointed out, this decision has been adopted on the initiative of the White House and the Pentagon, and not the Air Force command. This response is more eloquent than the most lavish assurances. Similarly no propaganda trickery can possibly alter the basic fact, namely that Hiroshima and Nagasaki have shown that mankind is now capable of self-destruction. Therefore, the improvement of weapons, regardless of pretty promises, is a sure way to destruction. Such is the present-day reality which calls for both reason and action.

CHEMICAL DEPLOYMENT PLANS MARK NEW PHASE IN ARMS RACE

LD051116 Moscow TASS in English 0954 GMT 5 Oct 85

[Text] Moscow, October 5 TASS -- The probability of chemical weapons being used has risen considerably, Soviet Academician Nikolay Zhavoronkov said in a TASS interview.

He said the appearance of binary weapons in the United States and plans to deploy them in Europe have marked the start of a new phase in the arms race.

The Soviet scientist gave several reasons why binary weapons have aroused special worry and apprehension around the world. Their production technology enables the aggressor to cover up his plans since the starting components can be made in the civilian chemical industry. One does not even need to conceal the stocks of these components and can partially use them, for instance for pest control or as a starting material in the chemical industry.

Since chemical weapons are relatively simple and cheap to manufacture, states harboring aggressive intentions could be tempted to produce them. Academician Zhavoronkov recalled in this connection that the Chilean junta has already starting producing the Sarin nerve gas.

He said the United States has piled up enough chemical weapons to be able to kill all living on earth. Despite this overkill capability, the United States has embarked on a program for building up its arsenal of chemical weapons even further.

The Soviet scientist said he believes the movement for establishing zones free from chemical weapons is especially important nowadays. "If the United States deploys binary weapons in West Germany and other countries, Europe will become a binary gas chamber," he said. "But is it possible to prevent accidental gas leaks or explosions?"

WEEKLY 'INTERNATIONAL OBSERVERS ROUNDTABLE'

LD062302 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1230 GMT 6 Oct 85

["International Observers Roundtable" program with Boris Andrianov, All-Union Radio foreign policy commentator; Dmitriy Antonovich Volskiy, editorial board member of Novoye Vremya, Vadim Nikolayevich Nekrasov, international observer for KOMMUNIST]

Soviet Arms Proposals

[Text] [Andrianov] Hello comrades! The week that is ending has been marked by an event of enormous political importance. Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and member of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, was on an official visit to France at the invitation of President Francois Mitterrand of the French Republic. The great importance of that trip was determined by the desire to reduce international tension and remove the threat of war that is hanging over mankind. For we live in a troubled age, and it strongly demands from statesmen clarity of political thought, responsibility, a definite set of priorities, courage, dynamism, purposefulness, and initiative. It is these very qualities that are demonstrated by the leadership of our country in the understanding that there is now no more urgent task than the struggle to strengthen peace on the planet earth and they are making more and more resolute efforts in that struggle.

Fresh evidence of this was the Soviet-French summit dialogue. Its results are of importance not only for relations between the Soviet Union and France: Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev's meeting with Francois Mitterrand will give an important positive impetus to the development of the situation in Europe and, of course, throughout the world.

[Nekrasov] The question of the very existence of life on earth is now facing peoples with greater acuteness than ever before, and it is first and foremost over Europe that the darkest cloud of nuclear death now hangs. Meanwhile, that continent, like no other because of its geographical density and oversaturation with weapons,partucularly vulnerable to armed conflict, especially a nuclear one. This fact insistently dictates the need for all Europeans at such a menacing time to take a stance of categorical resistance to war with all of its terrible consequences. All mankind is in fact faced with a choice: Either to continue the suicidal course toward a further buildup of the arms race which leads to increasingly risky balancing on the edge of a nuclear catastrophe or travel the path of serious, responsible talks aimed at establishing interstate relations of mutually advantegous cooperation which guarantees reliable security for all. It is appropriate to note that it is just such relations, based on a desire for cooperation, between the Soviet Union and France -- two states with different social systems -- that for many years have to a considerable degree been promoting the preservation of peace and stability in Europe and the whole world.

[Andrianov] Addressing French parliamentarians, Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev stressed how important it is right now to stop immediately, before it is too late, the infernal train of the arms race, to start reducing arms, to improve the international situation and develop peaceful cooperation between peoples. This, the Soviet leader noted, is in our mutual interests. It is a universal task: No one can allow themselves to sit idly by. It is today that such measures must be taken, because tomorrow it will become more difficult to try to reach agreement on them unless the trends in operation today which preserve and strengthen international tension are stopped. As far as our country's concerned, it is acting vigorously to halt the arms race and prevent a further growth of the threat that hangs over the world. As you know, the Soviet Union has unilaterally cut short the further stationing of medium-range missiles in Europe and has called on the United States to respond in the same way.

Our country has also unilaterally halted all nuclear explosions and has called on Washington to follow that example. The Soviet initiative on the reduction of armed forces and arms in central Europe is well-known. We come out strongly in favor of space being used exclusively for peaceful aims. Now the Soviet Union has taken fresh steps in the same direction. They were described in detail by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev in his speech to the French parliamentarians. First, the Soviet leadership proposed to the U.S. Government that agreement be reached on completely banning for both sides strike space weapons and reducing by 50 percent their nuclear weapons capable of reaching each other's territory.

[Volskiy] That proposal contains a practical solution of those same tasks which were agreed on by the Soviet Union and the United States this January as the aims of the Geneva talks. They consist, I will recall, of not only ending the arms race, but also sharply reducing the level of arms and at the same time preventing the arms race in space. The achievement of those aims would strengthen strategic stability and mutual trust. The Soviet delegation has already received instructions to submit concrete proposals on these questions and the authority to give an exhaustive explanation to the U.S. partners at the negotiating table.

[Andrianov] Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev also made a statement about a second important step by our country taken with the aim of ending the runious process of the arms race. It concerns medium-range nuclear systems in Europe. In order to make it easier to achieve an accord on their mutual reduction as soon as possible, the Soviet Union considers it possible to conclude a corresponding agreement separately without linking it directly to the problem of space and strategic weapons. Such an approach by our country takes into account that West Europe has an interest in solving the question of such a reduction: In other words, the Soviet Union is going halfway to meet those who have an interest in it as it does itself.

[Nekrasov] And in this connection Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev elucidated our country's position on the question of the place of the nuclear potential of France and Britain in the European balance of forces. That potential is growing rapidly, so naturally the Soviet Union cannot in fact close its eyes to it. We think that the statement by the French side that France's nuclear forces cannot be discussed without its participation is a reasonable one. Therefore we must try to find an acceptable way out by joint efforts; the Soviet Union is expressing its readiness to hold direct talks on this subject with France and, equally, with Britain. At the same time, it was stressed that our side would take France's security interests into account in the most careful way.

[Andrianov] The general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee also spoke of a third serious step by the Soviet Union in the European zone. On alert duty there are now 243 Soviet SS-20 medium-range missiles -- in other words, exactly the same number as there was last June when the additional stationing of our missiles was started in response to the siting of U.S. medium-range missiles in Europe. The SS-20 missiles that were additionally deployed have now been taken off alert duty and the stationary installations where they were sited will be dismantled in the next 2 months. Our countermeasures in relation to the territory of the United States itself, however, remain in force. In the European zone, the Soviet Union has completely removed the old SS-5 missiles from its armaments and is continuing to remove its SS-4 missiles. This means that in the European zone of our country the overall number of medium-range carrier rockets is now considerably less than 10 or even 15 years ago. Our country is adopting such a self-limitation guided by the broad interests of European security; now Europe has the right to expect a step in response by the United States -- an end to the further stationing of U.S. medium-range missiles on the European continent.

[Volskiy] The new proposals by the Soviet Union, combined with its previous acts, represent a whole complex of constructive and realistic measures.

Implementation of them would lead to a genuine turning point in the development of international relations -- a turning point, naturally, in favor of peace, security and cooperation among peoples. It may be said that is our program for improving the explosive international situation that is threatening peace. The realization of that program would also mean significant progress toward the banning and complete liquidation of nuclear weapons; saving mankind completely from the threat of nuclear war. Such an aim is deeply desired by, and important to, all peoples.

[Andrianov] And all in all, this is being emphasized in comments from abroad. That is because the visit of Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev to France and the new major peace initiatives of the Soviet Union put forward during the meeting of the general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee with French deputies, have given rise to numerous comments and large scale response abroad. The French paper MATIN, for example, which is close to the ruling socialist party, noting the great significance of the new Soviet proposals, has emphasized that the U.S. Administration ought to pay attention to them. According to a report published by another French newspaper, LES ECHOS, the proposal concerning a complete ban on space strike armaments for the USSR and United States, and the really radical reduction -- by 50 percent -- of the nuclear armaments capable of reaching each other's territory, which has been put forward will be attractive for West European political figures. The statement by the Soviet leader has become a major action, consonant with European public opinion, the British company BBC has noted, stressing that it is a very intelligent move in respect to West Europe. The new Soviet proposals -- the Japanese paper ASAHI has pointed out -- shows that the USSR is sincerely striving for progress at the Geneva talks, as well as at the upcoming Soviet-American summit in November. The Soviet leader's proposals, in this paper's opinion, will be assessed positively in West Europe.

Judging by reports from across the ocean, there are people there whom it does not suit. As the American company NBC has noted, President Reagan and his closest aides are quite uneasy about the influence of the Soviet Union's foreign policy initiatives on political and public circles. The Soviet leader has presented Soviet policy at the talks on the issues of control over armaments in a new light, NBC has stressed, acknowledging that Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev has indisuptable skills in rendering Soviet foreign policy views. THE WASHINGTON POST has pointed out the new Soviet approach to the problem of controlling armaments, which was shown in Paris by the outstanding public diplomacy of Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev.

World Reaction

[Nekrasov] I think, Boris Vasilyevich, that if we sum up comments on these first days, immediately following the close of the visit, notwithstanding a certain dissonance, which is quite understandable taking into account various trends in the Western world, these comments are dominated by general recognition of the cardinal nature of the Soviet Union's approach to the global problems of the present times, which millions of people are concerned with in a truly profound and sweeping way. The Soviet Union has put forward -- as the world press writes in an almost unanimous way -- a far-reaching complex of constructive and realistic measures, realization of which is capable of leading to a genuine turnaround in international relations. As the honored Soviet guest stressed in Paris, "to find and verify a course for a peaceful future, to diminish the terrible danger which hangs over the peoples, is, we believe, the primary duty of states and political figures before the present and future generations." It is clear, that it is only possible to follow this path, so to speak, together. The West should cover its part of the path now. Will it cover it, or not?

As Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev points out, it now appears that all responsible politicians agree with the fact that there could be no winners in a nuclear war.

At the same time, we are aware of that political force, which is at the disposal of militarist circles in the main Western countries, first of all, in the United States, of course; of that influence which has been gained, especially of late, by the military and industrial complex. That was why our warning sounded at a timely moment in Paris: We are strong enough -- Comrade Gorbachev said when addressing the deputies -- to give a crushing rebuff to any attempt to encroach upon the security and peaceful labor of our people.

[Andrianov] And in this connection, I believe, it is appropriate to recall the assessment of the situation made by the general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee in his speech on French television. There is little comfort in what is going on in the world today, he said.

Necessity For Talks

[Nekrasov] The same speech you have mentioned also contained quite an important reminder to Western political figures: One should build peace proceeding from reality; one should take reality into account -- Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev added -- this is a serious thing. Those in the West who believe that one country can act in the international arena alone, or a group of countries, have an incorrect vision of the modern world. It is not a secret, as was repeatedly noted in the course of the visit, that today it is already very difficult to negotiate not only complex issues, but also relatively simple problems; tomorrow it can become even more difficult to talk. Moreover, as Comrade Gorbachev has pointed out, events can take place, which would get out of control, capable of completely denying opportunities to search for a peaceful settlement of problems. Why is that? Primarily because the arms race may be taken into space. And certainly, the assertion that this is going to be an ostensibly nonnuclear armament is not trustworthy at all. We know already, for instance, that the principle of the so-called nuclear trigger, that is, of another combat use for nuclear weapons, is laid as a basis for the laser weapons, on which rest the chief hopes of the Washington "star wars" planners. [as heard]

[Andrianov] Incidentally, Vadim Nikolayevich, I would like to recall the fact that it is precisely these last few days that saw the 28th anniversary of the beginning of the space era of humanity, when the first Soviet sputnik emerged over earth. All our intentions were then, and are now, directed at the peaceful development of astronautics in the interests of the whole of mankind. But the United States, literally since the very early days, has been thinking of the military uses of space. First projects such these, appeared -- we know it now from reports carried by the American press -- literally 1 or 2 years after the space era had begun.

Chemical Weapons

[Nekrasov] Yes, the danger is mounting not only in the nuclear and space fields. Let us take the American plans for production of the binary chemical weapons. Their capability for massive destruction of people and, by and large, of the civil population has been touched upon, as you know, at the recent press conference in Moscow. These weapons are capable of killing millions of people in a matter of hours. It was typical when U.S. General Rogers, the NATO commander in chief in Europe, admitted recently -- this admittance was a part of the interview he has given to the French magazine SCIENCE ET VIE -- that Washington includes the new chemical weapons in the same category of combat resources as the tactical nuclear weapons. To establish some kind of measure of international control over the binary battle reserves, provided an appropriate international decision is taken, would rather be a difficult task.

European Participation

In short, what is involved is the growing danger of the existing agreements on limitation of the arms race, primarily of the nuclear one, losing their meaning; it would be extremely difficult to negotiate some kind of new measures. The wide circles of the peace-loving public and the antiwar movement are aware of all that; this is also understood by those Western political figures who think soberly. This is exactly why the Soviet Union's warning concerning the fact that what is involved today is not just the position of the Soviet Union and the United States, falls on fertile ground. The responsibility lies with other countries as well. Every responsible government or political figure should assume a clearcut position in respect to this matter.

[Andrianov] In this connection, the ideas and proposals concerning Europe, provision for European security and development of the process of detente on the continent, which were expressed by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev in the course of his visit to France, are assuming great international significance. On one hand, the assertion that peace in the entire world is especially dependent on the situation in Europe, is true. And on the other, it is clear that Europe more than any other continent is vulnerable to armed conflict, especially a nuclear conflict.

[Nekrasov] And in this connection, the Soviet side during the Paris meetings noted that at present security in Europe cannot be achieved by military means, by military force. This is a new contribution to the issue of the future of our continent, brought in by life itself. That is why a serious reinterpretation of European problems is necessary, as well as bringing views in the military and political spheres into full accordance with reality. Security in Europe, just as with international security on the whole, can only be achieved by following the path of the peaceful coexistence, detente, disarmament, confidence-building and development of cooperation. In this connection, one should note the great deal of attention, and, I would say, warm and well-disposed interest caused by the ideas expressed by Comrade Gorbachev as regards possibilities of consolidation and development of detente in various fields of overall European cooperation, not only in the political, but also in the economic and cultural fields, in protection of environment, etc.

Soviet-French Discussions

[Volskiy] Not only global and European problems were discussed at the Soviet-French talks, but questions of a regional character too. This is in my opinion quite natural, as Moscow's and Paris' stands on many such questions concur very substantially. On some questions there is mutual understanding, on others there are differences. Of course, differences are inevitable considering the different class character of the policies of the two states and the fact that they belong to different political organizations. Here are noteworthy examples from the past. In Central America, for example, France has never declared its support for the United States' interventionist policy. Moreover, 3 years ago, together with Mexico, it recognized the Salvadoran patriots, who had stirred up rebellion against the pro-U.S. regime, as being a party to military conflict, which gave them the possibility of feeling more confident in the international arena.

Now let's take the Near East. I won't go into the details of French policy in this stormy region -- it is far from simple -- but I will give just one recent fact. President Mitterrand, as you know, refused to take part in the meeting of leaders of developed capitalist states, which Reagan is convening. French television gave the protest against Washington's support of the Israeli attack on the PLO establishment in Tunis as one of the reasons for this decision.

Israeli Bombing of Tunis

[Nekrasov] Dmitriy Antonovich, the indignation in France and in many countries is quite understandable, as what is concerned here is an action really unprecedented in insolence and barbarity; moreover, one which took place many hundreds of kilometers from Israel.

[Volskiy] I would not call this attack completely unprecedented. I remember, for example, that in 1981 Israeli aircraft bombed the nuclear research center near Baghdad, or Israel's actions in the Lebanon. Its troops were forced to withdraw from the greater part of Lebanese territory, but the Air Force is still continually making strikes on regions deep in the country. Generally speaking, Israel is accustomed to violating state borders or flouting international law. Still, you are right. In some sense the action was unprecedented. Firstly, the place chosen for the strike, Tunisia, is a country which is not only situated far from Israel -- that is true, but it isn't everything. The main thing is that Tunisia is not even formally in a state of war with respect to Israel. Moreover, it is considered one of the so-called moderate Arab countries, on which Washington relies for support -- or in any case tries to rely -- particularly in its policy of foisting separate deals on the Arabs. A policy which, by the way, has become notably more active recently. In general view, the bombing of the PLO establishment in Tunis also strikes a blow against this policy, because the anger over this crime is too great in the Arab world.

[Nakrasov] So, Dmitriy Antonovich, it turns out that the United States, with Israel's assistance, destroys with one hand what it is building with the other?

[Volskiy] That is the impression one might get, but it is nevertheless a deceptive one. The TASS statement published in connection with Israel's latest crimes correctly says that it has once again shown the genuine worth of its hypocritical assurances, of its striving for peace in the Near East.

Israel's readiness for some kind of deal with the Arabs is also generally hypocrisy. It only wants the kind of deals which would mean the subjection of Arab countries and peoples to Israeli hegemony. They are trying to intimidate them. And as for the Palestinian question, Israel is trying to take it off the agenda altogether. It was for all these reasons that the bombing of the PLO establishment in Tunis was undertaken.

Near East Peace

Moreover, Israel evidently wanted to make up for the failure of its invasion of the Lebanon. Judging by the reaction of Arab countries, this action was perceived quite differently from the way Tel Aviv calculated. Firstly, it was seen as evidence of how dangerous a split among the Arabs is; of how important it is to strengthen their unity on the basis of the joint struggle for their rights. Secondly, it has now become particularly obvious that not the Camp David way, but only a just, all-embracing settlement can lead to peace in the Near East. You know that the Soviet Union favors precisely such a settlement, and here life itself, as it were, confirms the view expressed by Comrade Gorbachev in Paris, of the need to cooperate actively to quench the hotbeds of conflict and tension.

[Nekrasov] The more so as the unsettled nature of conflicts, in particular of the East War conflict, which is the fault of Israel and the United States, leads to serious consequences. Further evidence of this is the kidnapping of four employees of Soviet institutions in Lebanon by one of the extremist Muslim groupings in Beirut. One of them, as you know, was killed by the bandits.

In this connection, the Soviet Government statement says the primary cause of the civil strife in the Lebanon, of which Soviet citizens have been the innocent victims, is Israel which consciously fans up such strife.

[Volskiy] Vadim Nikolayevich, I will quote another part of the Soviet Government's statement. All those who could have put a stop to the criminal activities, to prevent the violence against Soviet people, but did not do everything possible to do so, also carry their share of responsibility. They cannot count on their behavior not having the most negative effect on the Soviet Union's attitude toward them either. I think those to whom these impartial words are addressed will understand their meaning.

Contadora Support

Digressing from the Near EAst, I would like to note the situation is also reaching a dangerous limit both in South Africa and Central America. With regard to Central America, for example, matters stand as follows: Either a further worsening of tension, an increase in the threat of United States intervention, with all the consequences which would ensure or a turn toward a just settlement, I repeat, to precisely a just settlement, which countries belonging to the mediatory Contadora Group of Latin American states in particular, are striving for. In fact, it recently completed drawing up a final version of a declaration of peace and cooperation for Central America. It is fitting to recall that both the Soviet Union and France support the Contadora Group's efforts. This confirms once again how varied the possibilities are for cooperation in various spheres in the matter of liquidating hotbeds of tension and conflict situations.

Soviet-French Relations

[Andrianov] Returning to the main theme of our talk today, I would like to stress that Soviet-French cooperation has long and sound traditions. This was repeatedly stressed during Comrade Gorbachev's visit to France. Soviet people remember well the joint struggle against fascism, the combat unity forged by the blood shed by French pilots of the Normandie-Neman regiment on the fronts of the Great Patriotic War and by the Soviet patriots on the territory of occupied France. We remember the space flight by the Soviet-French team, the active participation of French firms in the construction of the gas pipeline from the Soviet Union to West Europe, despite the sanctions and threats from Washington. We hold many other such examples carefully in our memory.

During the present Soviet-French summit meeting specific scientific-technical and cultural cooperation between the two countries were discussed. The favorable nature of such cooperation was noted by both the Soviet Union and France, which spoke in favor of perfecting its forms, including in the trade and economic sphere. The usefulness of holding regular political consultations between the foreign policy departments of both countries was stressed. The experience gained in this respect was acknowledged with satisfaction. Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev and Francois Mitterrand stated that the Soviet Union and France would continue to strengthen the existing ties in various spheres, and to find new areas of cooperation.

With this we end our roundtable meeting. Those who took part all thank you for your attention, esteemed comrade listeners. Goodbye and all the very best to you.

SHULTZ THREATENS MILITARY ACTION AGAINST NICARAGUA

LD040841 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1900 GMT 3 Oct 85

[Text] U.S. Secretary of State Shultz has grossly attacked Nicaragua again, threatening to undertake direct military action against this country, if necessary. Addressing members of the National Committee on American Foreign Policy, he advocated increasing the aid to the freedom fighters -- as Reagan's administration hypocritically calls the CIA-backed terrorist gangs of counterrevolutionaries, who commit bloody crimes against the Nicaraguan people.

PELL APPOINTED TO HEAD USIA RADIO STATIONS

LD050642 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0147 GMT 3 Oct 85

[Text] Washington, 3 October (TASS) -- It has been officially announced here that the director of the "Voice of America" radio station, Eugene Pell, is leaving his post and will be appointed president of the radio stations "Liberty" and "Free Europe" (RL and RFE) in the near future. He is replacing former right-wing Senator William Buckley [as received] in that post.

Although the Administration is publicly trying to present this change as "routine," observers are unanimously noting that this is yet another stage in a major "shake-up" in the leadership of the Reagan administration's subversive propaganda services. The right-wing millionaire publisher Malcolm Forbes, who is close to President Reagan, was recently appointed chairman of the board for International Broadcasting, which is in charge of RL and RFE, replacing Frank Shakespeare, who has been appointed ambassador to Portugal.

According to representatives of the U.S. Information Agency (USIA), Washington's chief foreign political propaganda, Pell has been sent to "strengthen" radio stations "Liberty" and "Free Europe", whose recent activity has caused serious concern among many members of Congress. As is clear from a recently published report from Congress's General Accounting Office, radios "Liberty" and "Free Europe," which broadcast to the USSR and the socialist countries and whose slanderous activity already causes indignation in the world, have of late descended to a level of insults addressed to the peoples of the socialist countries and to a level of distortion of the facts that is not even permitted by the regulations of the radio stations, themselves. Many programs have lost even the appearance of objectivity; quarrels and chaos reign among the emigrant rabble which has esconced itself in the Munich headquarters of "Radio Liberty" and "Radio Free Europe."

The White House has, therefore, sent Pell to "restore order" to the Munich factories of disinformation, which are closely linked to the CIA. However, there need be no doubt that the anti-Soviet provocative direction of the "products" of "Radio Liberty" and "Radio Free Europe" will not suffer any change with his arrival there. For this figure has long held the reputation of a professional anti-Sovietist. In particular, Pell has put in no little "work" in the sphere of disinformation, as he at one time headed the Moscow office of the U.S. television company NBC.

SOVIET-CANADIAN AGRICULTURE TALKS OPEN IN MOSCOW

LD042054 Moscow in English to North America 2300 GMT 3 Oct 85

[Excerpts] The second session of the Soviet-Canadian Mixed Agricultural Commission has opened in Moscow Thursday [3 October]. More details in this report:

At the opening meeting of the Soviet-Canadian session, held in the Soviet Ministry of Agriculture, John Wise, the Canadian minister of agriculture, said he's very optimistic about future bilateral contacts.

[Begin Wise recording] We have a great deal of similarities, really, between the two countries geographically, regions of the country that we both have, and to a large extent, with reference to the cropping practices, procedures and indeed the crops and commodities themselves and we certainly appreciate the large volume of trade which takes place between the two countries and we're anxious in servicing the Soviet market and enhancing that market and we're interested in other cooperative ventures particularly in animal breeding and also in plant breeding as well. There is certainly room for a greater movement in the sale of high quality Canadian cattle and there's a lot of potential that could be followed up, I'm quite certain, with reference to embryo transplants (?as well). [End recording]

Mr Wise also pointed that the two sides should continue the joint research work and the exchange of scientists which has been going on successfully in the past couple of years.

Valentin Mesyats, Soviet minister of agriculture, in his opening statement at the Soviet-Canadian session on agriculture, said this: [Begin Mesyats recording in Russian, fading into English translation] We think that bilateral cooperation in this field is very important. In the short time since the mixed agricultural commission was set up we have exchanged around a dozen delegations of experts. There has been a constant exchange of general information. Scientists in the two countries have received hundreds of seed samples of plants. We should like to see more direct contacts between researchers in various Soviet republics and Canadian provinces. We hope during the current session we will be able to outline further areas of mutual interest and we are also hopeful that our agricultural exchanges will remain effective and of mutual benefit. [end recording]

Nuriyev Meets with Delegation

LD041934 Moscow TASS in English 1852 GMT 4 Oct 85

[Text] Moscow, October 4 TASS -- Deputy Chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers Ziya Nuriyev today received Canada's Minister of Agriculture John Wise, and other members of the Canadian agricultural delegation now staying in the Soviet Union in connection with the second session of the mixed Soviet-Canadian Commission on Cooperation in Agriculture.

Questions of scientific-technological and economic cooperation in agriculture and related branches were discussed in an atmosphere of good will. The sides expressed mutual satisfactionwith the course of this cooperation and discussed some questions of its deepening and enhancing its efficiency for mutual benefit.

Minister of Agriculture of the USSR Valentin Mesyats took part in the talk.

Nikonov Meets Delegation Head

LD050831 Moscow Television Service in Russian 0810 GMT 5 Oct 85

[From the "Novosti" newscast]

[Text] CPSU Central Committee Secretary Comrade Nikonov received Canadian Agriculture Minister John Wise on 4 October. Questions pertaining to the state and prospects for the development of Soviet-Canadian agricultural cooperation were discussed during their conversation.

ECONOMIC TALKS HELD WITH CAMBODIAN OFFICIALS

PM301321 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 30 Sep 85 First Edition p 4

[TASS report: "In Mutual Interests"]

[Text] The second session of the Soviet-Cambodian Intergovernmental commission for Trade, Economic, Scientific, and Technical Cooperation was held in Moscow 26-29 September. Questions of the further development of economic ties between the USSR and the PRK were discussed. Attention was devoted to improving their effectiveness. It was noted that in the period since the first session was held the main efforts have been focused on the most important cooperation projects in the power industry, agriculture, transportation, and communications, cadre training, and others.

The progress of the fulfillment of pledges of Soviet-Cambodian agreements on reciprocal goods deliveries this year and measures to fulfill the agreed volumes of foreign trade freight shipments were examined.

Questions linked with the consultations between USSR and PRK planning organs on questions of developing economic cooperation between the two countries for the period 1986-1990 were discussed.

The Soviet delegation was headed by N.V. Talyzin, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, and the Cambodian delegation by Chea Soth, vice chairman of the PRK Council of Ministers.

The session was held in an atmosphere of friendship and complete mutual understanding.

ANNIVERSARY OF RELATIONS WITH LAOS NOTED

LD061728 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1530 GMT 6 Oct 85

[From the "Vremya" newscast -- announcer-read report]

[Text] On the occasion of the 25th anniversary of the establishment of diplomatic relations between the Soviet Union and Laos, the CPSU Central Committee, presidium of the Supreme Soviet, and Council of Ministers of the USSR have sent a congratulations cable to the leaders of the Lao People's Democratic Republic, Kaysone Phomvihan and Souphanouvong. The message stresses that the USSR is unswerving in the great significance it attaches to the development of friendly relations with Laos. These relations have been enriched with new forms and content, are truly fraternal, and are constantly developing according to principles of Marxism-Leninism and socialist internationalism. The telegram expresses confidence that the inviolable friendship between the Soviet Union and Laos will continue to reliably serve the tasks of socialist and communist construction in our countries, the strengthening of the unity of the socialist community, and the interests of peace and security in Asia and throughout the world.

on this momentous occasion the Laos leaders have sent to Comrades Gorbachev, Gromyko, and Ryzhkov greetings expressing gratitude to the CPSU and the USSR Government and people for assistance in the struggle to liberate the country and to construct socialism.

FURTHER REPORTAGE ON GORBACHEV VISIT

Joint News Conference Held

LD041442 Moscow World Service in English 1400 GMT 4 Oct 85

[Excerpts] The General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Soviet Communist Party, Mikhail Gorbachev, and the French President, Francois Mitterrand, have had their final round of talks in Paris. They completed an exchange of opinions on a range of major international issues and (?some region) issues. The two countries signed an agreement on economic cooperation for 1986-1990. Mikhail Gorbachev and Francois Mitterrand gave a news conference. Addressing it, the Soviet leader described his talks with the French leadership as substantive, constructive, and open, and held in an atmosphere of goodwill. He said the two sides focused on the burning international issues and the issue of putting an end to the arms race. Mikhail Gorbachev said that the world situation requires that responsible decisions be taken and called for a transition to concrete action. The USSR is in favor of a radical reduction of nuclear weapons. It is against the militarization of space. Mikhail Gorbachev emphasized that the Soviet Union is for reducing medium-range nuclear weapons in Europe.

In his address to the news conference, President Mitterrand said France is interested in achieving a stronger peace. He reaffirmed that his country will not be taking part in militarizing outer space.

On the issue of bilateral relations, the leaders of the two countries voiced a readiness to expand them in various areas and said that they had agreed to make greater efforts to increase the effectiveness of bilateral ties.

Mikhail Gorbachev advanced the idea of international cooperation in achieving controlled nuclear fusion, which will give the human race a practically inexhaustable source of energy. He also renewed the Soviet proposal for setting up an international body for the peaceful exploration of space. Answering questions from newsmen, Mikhail Gorbachev said, among other things, that all the Soviet disarmament initiatives advanced earlier remain in force. He said that it might be a good idea if the Soviet proposal for complete and universal disarmament be considered again. He also called for collective international efforts to achieve a lasting settlement in the Middle East.

Gorbachev Statement, Interview

LD041943 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 6 Oct 85 First Edition pp 1, 2

[TASS report: "Joint Press Conference by M.S. Gorbachev and F. Mitterrand"]

[Text] Paris, 5 Oct -- M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and French President F. Mitterrand held a joint press conference yesterday in the Elysee Palace to mark the completion of their talks.

Opening the press conference, F. Mitterrand noted that "it was with much interest that he had taken note of the whole package of issues set forth by Mikhail Gorbachev".

Then Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev issued a statement. He said:

Mr President, it seems I can take over from you now. I would like to say again why and for what we came to France. We in the Soviet Union proceed from the premise that the present situation in the world is at such a stage of its development when responsible decisions and responsible actions are needed, first of all by countries pulling considerable international weight. I have in mind first of all the Soviet Union, the United States, France and Britain, and other countries. The realities of the world today are such that we can build a better, safer world, ensure progress and achieve an improverent of the international situation if all this becomes our common endeavour.

Despite the entire difference of our political systems, ideologies and world outlooks we all face the need to find the road to such a world that would be characterised by trust, mutual understanding and cooperation. We are for a dialogue. In any case, the Soviet leadership is of the opinion that all this is simply a demand of common sense.

For the Soviet Union, France is an important partner for discussing such questions. Firstly, this is explained by traditions, and these traditions nourish our present-day relations. I think they will nourish our relations in the future as well. When I speak of traditions I have in view not only contacts of a political nature, on the state leadership level, but of all that for decades and centuries has already united our peoples.

This is the solid foundation that has always enabled the Soviet Union and France to meet at the most difficult periods of human history and discuss the most acute, vitally important problems, to engage in a search for their solutions. It is exactly proceeding from this that we accepted President Francois Mitterrand's invitation to visit France. I want to express to you once again heartfelt gratitude for your hospitality.

Concerning what you said, I add that our countries both before the visit and during the visit -- and it is already nearing its end -- were and remain in their socio-political systems, profess their own ideology and today belong to the same military-political alliances to which they belonged yesterday and to which they will beong tomorrow. Neither I nor Mr President has ever set the task of converting each other into the other's creed in the course of the talks.

But does the fact that we belong to different systems and military-political organisations diminish the importance of the dialogue in which the Soviet Union and France, the general secretary and the president are engaged?

I think perhaps, in a certain sense this even has its advantages. And this conclusion is confirmed by what the president has said when characterising the talks and meetings held during these days -- and we had three meetings with the president face to face, not to speak of the conversations with other French politicians. It is very important that this echoes the president's thought. While each remaining in his real situation the leaders of the Soviet Union and France managed to rise above the existing differences and analyse the processes taking place in the world, compare their evaluations, exchange views on what the contribution of the Soviet Union and France could be to making the events in the world and the international situation change for the better. I think this is evidence of the existence of an immense sense of responsibility both on the part of the Soviet leadership and the leadership of France for the destiny of the world. And this, I think, is quite important for conducting the dialogue and outlining ways of joint or parallel actions to improve the situation in the world.

On the whole, we highly appreciate the conversations of the past few days with President Mitterrand and other French statesmen and politicians. Those were substantive conversations, noted by a constructive character. They were actually taking place in an openforum and in the spirit of mutual respect and goodwill.

The president has already touched upon the problems covered in those conversations. They were centered on the more urgent problems of the present-day dangerous international situation. We have quite understandable differences on a number of concrete questions. But there also emerged a common understanding of the need to do everything possible to improve the situation, to remove the threat looming over the peoples and to contribute to a turn from confrontation to the relaxation of tension. I received the impression from our meetings that the president shares this point of view.

Mr President has said that the word "detente" featured in our talks not because we indulged in reminisces of the past. This, I would say, is a certain lesson of the process of detente. We will not now go into reasons why that process has been weakened and subverted to some extent. All of us have realized the urgent need to return to detente if we want to think big and approach the problems of safeguarding peace with great responsibility. In this context, the realistic possibility to return to detente has been mentioned here and also in the course of our conversations.

Questions of how to put an end to the unprecedented arms race were most important in our conversations. When in Paris, we informed the president, the parliament, the public and the people of France of the proposals that we made to the leadership of the United States of America and which have already become a subject of study at the Geneva talks. These questions cause the concern not only of the leaders of France and the Soviet Union, the cause and concern of all nations, of all clear-headed political leaders, and of all those who have not become insanely obsessed with the arms race, confrontation and hostility.

I am not going to repeat now our new proposals. You are familiar with them. I only want to say that after our exchange of views, and they were very substantial, the leaders of France, and the president personally, expressed understanding of the importance of our proposals, and their constructive potential. When we made these proposals we spelled out what the Soviet leadership was stating over the past several months. The Soviet Union is prepared for radical reductions of nuclear arms under the condition of keeping space strike arms from outer space. This is the crux of the problem. The way the question is posed is in line with the January accords between the ministers of foreign affairs of the Soviet Union and the United States.

Several weeks and months ago our partners in the Geneva talks were saying -- Where are your radical proposals? Information on these matters reached us. Now we hear from the same sources: Why are you so pressing with your proposals?

This reminds me of a situation involving Hodzha Nasreddin. As the story has it, he was riding on his donkey in Bukkara and people were calling out at him saying it was the first time they saw an old donkey carrying a young one. But when Nasreddin put the donkey on his shoulders and continued on his way he again heard jets, this time they were just the opposite.

We think that the time has come for concrete actions. Why? Because we have reached a point when it is no longer enough to say, yes, we stand for a better world; yes, we will take the road to normalization of the international situation. If these words are not matched with concrete deeds, we call it political demagogy and deception of the peoples.

In addition to these measures which the Soviet Union took earlier unilaterally, we put forward new radical proposals so as to impart a constructive character to the Geneva talks. We know perhaps better than anyone -- at least not worse than the Americans -- what is in store for the world if the arms race is not stopped now. This awareness adds to our responsibility.

Given that the situation is very tense, if another round of the arms race, related to space, is initiated, I do not know if we will be able to conduct talks. How can they be approached? This should be clear to everyone. Incidentally, the press, too, should rise to an understanding of the seriousness of the situation in present-day international affairs. You journalists serve not only editors and those who finance your publications. You should serve primarily the peoples. The general demand as we in the Soviet Union understand and feel it is that it is necessary to stop, to gather one's wits, to think of where we are, and to begin to act, and to take concrete steps. It is a simple formula, a simple plan, but we think that it has a sense of responsibility for the destiny of one's people, for the destinies of the other peoples. It contains a proposal, a constructive quest. We are ready for this.

What I know about the results of the meetings of the Soviet foreign minister with U.S. President Reagan and Secretary of State Shultz is encouraging, to some extent. We did not hear the typical, stereotype reply, "no, it is propaganda." I think that sober, realistic thoughts are germinating in the public opinion of the United States of America, in the political community and in the Congress. Naturally, I can hardly speak for the United States. But we hope that both in Geneva, where another round of talks has begun and where our proposals have been put on the table, and at the forthcoming meeting with President Reagan that the United States will approach the problem with a sense of serious responsibility. In this sense I share the view of Mr. Mitterrand that there are problems which directly concern the Soviet Union and the United States and that the process of the talks should be moved from the stalemate towards normalization. The Soviet Union has a serious intention to have the world situation changed.

We touched in the talks in Paris also upon problems of medium-range missiles. We would like to move this question away from a point at which it is hard to come to grips with it. This question is also being discussed in Geneva with the U.S. side. It is a fact that Pershings and cruise missiles are being deployed in Western Europe.

Developing our position, we have made new proposals on medium-range missiles. We think -- and I told Mr. Mitterrand so -- that a new situation is being created in this way. Generally speaking, we have not entered and are not going to enter the French nuclear forces in the "Soviet-U.S. roster."

We are saying that this problem should be discussed with France, and also with Britain. A possibility is being opened for beginning an exchange of opinions with France, which may lead at some point to talks. We are not setting before France the question of a reduction of her nuclear potential, or of stopping the fulfillment of her military programs. This is a matter for France. As we understand it, France will approach this question from her own positions with due account for all the processes taking place in the world. But we say: Let us start talking, let us start studying this problem in interconnection with other ones. Perhaps there could be some flexible equivalent for the corresponding nuclear systems. In any case this is the first step. We had an indepth exchange of views on this score with Francois Mitterrand. As I understand it, the president is not against continuing an exchange of views on this problem. And we too stand for this. Through our ambassador in London we addressed a similar proposal to Mrs. Margaret Thatcher.

We also explained the essence and significance of the unilateral step that has just been taken by us and as a result of which the number of the Soviet SS-20 missiles in the European zone now does not exceed the number that we had as of June last year. The additionally deployed SS-20 missiles have now been withdrawn from standby alert while the permanent installations for housing these missiles will be dismantled in the coming two months. Those who would like to verify this can take photographs. It is being intimated that we allegedly intend to haul these missiles to Asia. These are unscrupulous intimations. When the Soviet Union makes a deal with somebody it does it seriously.

We have as many missiles in Asia as is needed to balance the corresponding potential of the United States in that region -- neither more nor less. If the United States builds up we will build up. If the situation changes for the better, our reaction will be adequate.

The president and I devoted much time to questions of European security. We have experience of joint efforts with France intaht field. That experience made it possible to accumulate a substantial potential of cooperation, which can be used to carry on the European process based on the Helsinki accords and to fill it with even greater contents.

Addressing the parliament yesterday, I presented our position on the entire complex of these problems. I would not like to repeat it. The crux of the matter, I think, is that both sides, the USSR and France, remain committed to the cause of expanding and carrying on the European process, and Mr President has reiterated it now. Like France, we stand for the implementation of the provisions of the Helsinki Act in all its parts and it is of my profound conviction, moreover, that the improvement of the situation in Europe would be vastly important to the whole world.

The military-political groupings come into immediate contact in Europe. Its peoples have learned major lessons from their own history. After the Helsinki conference, there also exists a legal base making it possible to advance on the road of cooperation and security. The USSR and France were co-authors of the Stockholm conference. We believe that it is time to turn it more resolutely towards drafting agreements. Incidentally, as we understand, and in the view of France too, there are possibilities to energize a search for mutually acceptable solutions.

During the talks with President Mitterrand we devoted proper attention to the study of a number of regional problems and existing seats of tension. We have mutual understanding in the evaluationof some of these problems. As to other problems, there are differences both in analysis and in approach. But we agree that it is necessary to eliminate these seats by political means under conditions of full respect for the independence and sovereignty of each country. And it is within the framework of this exchange of viess that we dealt with the situation in the south of Africa, the Middle East, in central America and other problems.

We came to Paris with the desire to give a new impulse to bilateral Soviet-French relations. As I understand it, the president's positioncoincides with this striving of ours. The results of the discussion of these quesitons give reason to hope for an intensification of the political dialogue and a growth of economic and trade cooperation between the USSR and France.

We positively assess the fact that the pace of development of economic and trade ties has quickened in recent years--they have doubled. But what we have does not accord today with the scale of the possibilities of our countries. That is why we have agreed to increase the search, to impart more initiative to our relations in thesphere of trade and economic cooperation. An agreement has just been signed on these questions. Many concrete, interesting projects have appeared, among them several big ones. On our part we welcome this. We think that this, too, will facilitate an improvement of the overall situation.

As I have already stressed, we have agreed to build up political dialogue. I invited Mr President on behalf of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet to pay a visit to our country. He will be a welcome guest in the Soviet Union. When intervals between visits become shorter, perhaps there will be fewer problems. We have also exchanged opinions on the following idea. There is a project known as Tokamak.

The Soviet Union, France, the United States, Japan and other countries have contributed to the development of that project of thermonuclear synthesis. It would be interesting to consider whether this project can be carried out by joint efforts in the present-day situation to provide a possibility for leading our research on the road to obtaining a practically inexhaustible source of energy. It is a tempting idea. It would be timely since it is a peaceful idea -- and there are those who advance very different things. Our specialists have told me that there are realistic hopes for the fulfillment of this proposal of ours. On the whole, the results of the talks, in our view, are not only positive but I would say even impressive. They serve the interests of the Soviet and French peoples, and the broad interests of European and international security.

In conclusion, using the opportunity, I express gratitude to President Francois Mitterrand, to the government, politicians and public figures of France, to all the French women and men we have met during these days, for their hospitality and sentiments of affection and respect expressed by them for our country and for the entire Soviet people.

Mikhail Gorbachev and Francois Mitterrand subsequently answered questions from journalists.

Question (**French Television Antenne-2**): Mr. General Secretary, you said that the Soviet Union could not close its eyes to the development of the French nuclear forces. Do you wish that the level of the French nuclear forces would not be built up, or that it would be built up moderately, in other words, should the modernization of the French nuclear forces become, in your view, a subject of discussions with the Soviet Union?

Mikhail Gorbachev: I think I have made quite a definitive statement on this question. We suggest that the process of a direct exchange of opinion be initiated. All the concrete questions can be discussed in the course of that process.

Question (Soviet Television): Mr. President, do you think it possible to achieve an international agreement blocking the arms race in outer space?

Francois Mitterrand: I am no clairvoyant. The arms race has been rising to qualitatively new levels for a long time and has now reached the space level. If reason has not prevailed up to now, who can say that common sense will prevail today? I do not make forecasts. I have put forward a wish, a political stand. Yes, there is a need for a compromise that will be acceptable to both sides and beneficial to all. I do not want to go into technical details of the character of such a compromise. As for the position of France, I have already said that she does not participate in it, she is not seeking it, she wants to devote herself to the peaceful exploration of space. Naturally, as a great power with a population of 55 million, she shows an interest in everything concerning questions of war and space.

Question (Italian newspaper SECOLO XIX): Mr General Secretary, as I understand, you have announced the dismantling of all Soviet SS-20 missiles in excess of 243. I would like to know if you confirm this. As to the separate agreement on medium-range missiles in Europe, do you believe it possible that the basis for this agreement can be found in what was termed in 1982 as the "agreement during the walk in the woods"?

Mikhail Gorbachev: I confirm that 243 missiles are now on standby alert in the European zone. This is exactly as there were in June 1984. The other missiles have been removed and within the next two months the permanent launching installations will be dismantled. Our reply measures related directly to the territory of the United States remain in force. As to the further process of talks on medium-range missiles, in order to invigorate it and impart a realistic direction to this process we have proposed to work out a separate accord on this type of arms.

And at the same time we proposed a direct exchange of views with France and Britain. In our opinion this makes it possible to start practical steps. We are prepared to go in this direction as far as our partners are prepared to go -- I refer to the United States, and where it concerns French and British missiles -- to France and Britain.

Francois Mitterrand: I would like to specify that not on a single question will France deny an exchange of views, the more so to such a country as the Soviet Union. But at present I do not see possibilities for talks, although I told the general secretary this morning that it is necessary to precisely determine the subject of discussion. I will add that as to the question of counting our forces, the United states has not distanced itself from the position of France on this question and France has no reason to separate its position from the U.S. one when it comes to counting forces in the world and in Europe, with due account, of course, for everything that I have already said about outer space and for the fact that France retains full freedom to express herself and think. We are an independent country which has its independent strategy and which speaks out accordingly.

Question (BBC): Mr. General Secretary, I would like to touch on the Soviet Union's relations with Mrs Thatcher. Why, in your opinion, should the British premier take a different position than France on the question of its medium-range nuclear systems? Secondly, have you resigned yourself to the Thatcher government's decision to expel Soviet diplomats?

Mikhail Gorbachev: I am replying to the first question. I think that so far Britain's position on medium-range missiles was formed under one set of conditions. Today I invite the president of France -- and I have already done this -- and Mrs Thatcher to make a new approach in connection with the radical proposals made by the Soviet Union. This indeed cardinally changes the situation. And if the situation is new, there should be new approaches as well. I agree with President Mitterrand -- we have already discussed it with him -- that it would be strange if we had begun to discuss this question yesterday and would have entered talks and reached accord already today. But I remember at the same time that Mr Mitterrand, in particular, during his last visit to Moscow, presenting his position on the French nuclear forces, said that France was committed to a search for peace and to the process of disarmament. In his view, today the Soviet Union and the United States should be the first to make their contribution, which does not at all rule out that at some point France will join this process. A new situation is emerging today and new possibilities are being opened. It was natural on my part to invite the president to exchange opinions on this situation.

Now I will answer your second question. Every embassy in the country to which it has been posted has instructions from its government to study processes, and to supply information on processes taking place in the country in question so that there should be nothing unpredictable in relations, either in bilateral relations or in international problems. This information, I think, is a natural process. It involves all countries. If anyone wants to spoil relations and to prevent their improvement as soon as the signs of an international dialogue, of a thaw appear, forces immediately come to the force which have their social order. They are always ready. It is "quick response forces" intended to spoil the international situation. But who has involved Mrs Thatcher in these affairs, when all the representatives of the Soviet Union are en masse charged with spying, I do not know. We proceed from the assumption that the Soviet Union is interested in relations with Britain to a no bigger extent than Britain is interested in relations with the Soviet Union. I repeat, we are for the development of relations and a political dialogue, and of economic relations with Britain who is also our long standing partner. I believe this question is already exhausted.

Question (GDR Television): Comrade Gorbachev, I believe that after the World War II the Soviet Union has made more than a hundred proposals directed at strengthening peace and achieving disarmament. Are they still in force?

Mikhail Gorbachev: It would really be a good thing to return to some of the good old proposals on general and complete disarmament that were gradually driven into a corner and are now in a Cinderella position. And that, mind you, is a fundamental issue. Had attention been given in time to this proposal of ours I am sure we would not be living in the present situation in the world. Such proposals that were of a long-term nature, and did not appear like a reaction to some current process, to some current situation, all such proposals of ours remain in force.

Question (correspondent of Dutch television): Mr General Secretary, could you name the number of SS-20 missiles throughout the territory of the Soveit Union? You know that the Dutch Government must adopt a decision starting with November 1 on U.S. missiles.

Mikhail Gorbachev: Your leadership is informed of our steps and it has the possibility of considering our proposals. As to information on how many missiles and of what type - I think it would take much time for me to answer this question. The more so since this concerns Europe and the entire European zone, and goes beyond even the limits of the Urals till the 80th meridian. I think this is enough for the Netherlands.

Question (Israeli Radio): You have insisted on the need for concrete steps to solve problems of seats of regional conflicts. In what concerns the Middle East wouldn't the restoration of diplomatic relations with the State of Israel be one of such concrete steps by the Soviet Union? If not, why?

Mikhail Gorbachev: You feel by the reaction of the hall that I even do not have to answer your questions because my answer is obvious. Still I will answer your question. The situation in the Middle East is a serious one and Mr President has already said it. This gives rise to concern both of the Soviet Union and France. We will exchange views with the French leaders in the search for the best solution of this problem. The Israeli leadership is pursuing a myopic policy is it wantw to ensure its national interests by way of separate deals. These can be only some temporary success. The issue must be solved cardinally. The Soviet Union has always taken part and will take part in the cardinal solution of the problem, in improving the entire situation in the Middle East, and will act with a sense of great responsibility in this direction so that the situation in that region would not escape control. It is necessary to search for political approaches to a settlement.

There are those who have no interest in the participation of the Soviet Union. But the presence of the Soviet Union in the Middle East is an objective factor and we do not foresake our role. We stand for collective efforts, and I share the President's view in this respect. As for the restoration of relations with Israel, I think that the sooner the situation in the Middle East returns to normal, the quicker we can proceed to consideration of this question. There will be no obstacles for us then. We took part in the establishment of the State of Israel, we recognize the sovereignty of that State and its right to exist and to its security. But as for how security is understood by the ruling circles of Israel and by us, we differ substantially.

Perhaps, you will put more questions to the President? (laughter) Francois Mitterrand; It is less often that they see you here. (laughter)

Q. (U.S. CBS TV Company): Why not allow all Jews to emigrate from the Soviet Union if they wish to do so? Could you say how many political prisoners there are in the Soviet Union?

Mikhail Gorbachev: I have answered these questions in my **interview** to French television. I have nothing to add.

1.Question (French TV Company TF-1): You said in your speech yesterday that the world economy and technological progress called for exchanges of people and ideas. Are you planning in the near future to open the doors of the Soviet Union wider and to give Soviet people the possibility to travel freely to the West and Westerners a possibility to come to the Soviet Union?

Mikhail Gorbachev: We think that the Helsinki process embraces all the problems, including humanitarian ones and exchanges of ideas, information and tourists. We fully support all this. And I think that the more the situation improves, the broader the contacts will be. On the other hand, the broader the contacts, the quicker the situation will improve. Anyway, when it does not come to attempts to use exchanges for political, provocative purposes, to poison the atmosphere and intervene in internal affairs, the doors of our country are already now open to everyone. Here is an example: A group of Americans decided to make a journey down the Volga. They came from different cities of the USA. I learned about it when they had already returned to the U.S. and were sharing their impressions of the journey. Two ships with Americans on board made a cruise on the entire Volga. You know what they said? Everything we had heard about the Soviet Union, both people and what the Soviet Unionis like in gneral, convinces us that they are the same people are we are, with the same goals, thoughts friendliness and aspirations. That is why if the well-known centres do not use human communication and introduce elements which poison relations and interfere in our internal affairs, the Soviet Union stands for the development of exchanges on the basis of equality. But the Soviet Union cannot be talked to as some quarters take the liberty of talking to dozens of states and governments, thinking absolutely nothing of them. The Soviet Union will put in its place anyone if necessary.

Question (French radio broadcasting company Europe-1): Mr General Secretary, when we see you, we always get good news from the Soviet Union. I would like to ask what you have told the President about Sakharov, Shcharanskiy and Nudel.

Mikhail Gorbachev: When it comes to the reunification of families, mixed marriages and other humanitarian questions, these questions are considered by competent agencies in a careful manner. I said this to the president.

Question (Radio Canada): Mr General Secretary, does the Soviet Union have a chance to avenge itself inLebanon or to protect its citizens, or is it as helpless as the Western countries?

Mikhail Gorbachev: I think there is no reason to speak about helplessness. The influence of the Soviet Union and of other countries, including France, is tremendous in all instances, including in this matter. I will only say that we are resolute opponents of terrorist methods. This is unacceptable. We have categorically expressed ourselves on this score and we now put everything into motion that we have at our disposal to find a solution to this quesiton. I think that those who embark on the road of terrorist methods will not achieve their aims.

Question (GDR radio): I also have a question for the general secretary. Here in Paris you have spoken at length about the non-militarization of outer space. Are there new concrete plans of joint space flights, such as three years ago?

Mikhail Gorbaechv: Yes, we will continue cooperation with France along these directions. We have good experience in this respect. We even thought maybe about carrying out a joint flight once again. We exchanged views on this with the President.

We adhere to the idea of the peaceful uses and exploration of outer space, and big successes can be achieved here. I think you know about our proposals in the United Nations Organization in this respect. It would be possible to set up an organization, sited in Paris and launch peaceful studies of outer space.

Question (U.S. ABC TV COMPANY); Mr General Secretary, you hinted in your statement this morning that ther were elements of political demagogy in the U.S. reaction to your proposal on arms cuts. Do you mean President Reagan? If this is so, does not it contravene your statements to TIME magazine that rhetoric should be softened during preparations for the Geneva meeting?

Mikhail Gorbachev: I want to reiterate everything I said in the interview to representatives of TIME magazine. I would like to note right away that the remark I made was based on the information I had received. It would be, I think, irresponsible to create the impression that all this is a propaganda shootout.

As for the position of Mr. Reagan, I was told this by Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze -- sensed on the part of the President and those who participated in the conversation, I mean Mr Shultz, Mr McFarlane and others, a serious attitude to our proposals. We hope that this will be really so. We do not want to do damage to the security of the United States. This does not enter our plans. We do not want to outplay the United States of America and do not advise them to try to do so either.

Question (French journalist): Messrs. President and General Secretary, you have found points of contact in your positions on the Middle East and what are they?

Mikhail Gorbachev: The President said this about it. We are prepared to participate in an international collective search for ways to improve the situation in an international collective search for ways to improve the situation in the Middle East. I welcome this.

Question (London GUARDIAN): Do you make questions of reducing strategic arms dependent on agreement by the United States to discontinue the development of space arms or do you not consider these issues to be interdependent? To what extent are you inclined to reach agreement with President Reagan during the meeting in Geneva?

Mikhail Gorbachev: I think that at this press conference we should not get ahead of the act and deal with the meeting in Geneva. That is a serious matter after all. Both we and, I think, the U.S. side understand this and are preparing accordingly. As to the concrete part of your question I will say that in our opinion we must reach agreement on the non-militarization of space and on a radical reduction of strategic nuclear arms on earth.

Question (BBC): Mr General Secretary, President Mitterrand has said that he is not prepared to start talks with the Soviet Union on medium-range missiles. Why?

Mikhail Gorbachev: I do not understand why you have this impression. What I was saying was that by our steps we, so to say, impart movement to this process, impart dynamism to it, begin to move it off the ground, and that possibilities are opening up of contacts both with the Americans and with French and Britain.

Question (a journalist from Lebanon): The Middle East capitals are awaiting with hope and even with alarm your meeting with President Reagan. They fear its possible consequences. What place does that region hold in your priorities, what would be your reaction if the U.S. delegation refused to discuss with you the destiny of that region which the United States regards as its preserve. We know your principled stand on the question of Arab territories occupied by Israel but what would your concrete position be in practice if Syria would again take to arms?

Mikhail Gorbachev: Everything taking place in the Middle East worries us. We have never been aloof of a search for ways to settle the situation in the Middle East on a just basis. This means that troops must be withdrawn from occupied territories, that the Palestinian problem must be resolved on the basis of self-determination, and that the indivisibility of Lebanon and its peaceful development and the legitimate rights of the Israeli people, the Israeli state, must be ensured. It is in this direction that a solution must be looked for. I think that other approaches -- by separate deals and circumventing maneuvers -- can only lead to some temporary settlement, but will not produce a solution of the problem so that a lasting peace in the Middle East should be created. That is why collective efforts are needed to search for truly realistic ways out of this situation. And as to what the U.S. thinks is their sphere of "vital interests," as you say, who knows what they may think.

The U.S. claim "vital interests" now here, now there. Let the U.S. think about this formula.

Meanwhile, this is one of the preconditions leading to misunderstanding and acute situations. If one announces everything in the world as a zone of one's "vital interests," what will be left for the other peoples? For two hundred states? That status of vassals, or what? This does not accord at all with the concept of the equal development of the peoples and with the possibility for every people to exercise their sovereign rights and to make their choice. But this process often proceeds painfully.

We make no secret of our position. When people in one country or another choose a road of progressive change and seek to formulate an independent policy, to mold their awareness in the spiritual field and to establish ther economic institutions, we welcome this. We are on the side of those peoples. But as soon as we say so, it is stated: "The hand of Moscow," "the hand of Moscow!"

International relations are being practiced in a changeable and moteley world in the context of political, cultural and economic developments at different levels of progress. And we should take every step with great responsbility. It is inadmissible to proceed from imperial considerations. I apply this also to the Soviet Union. We have never allowed and will not allow this to happen.

Moscow TV Coverage

Moscow Television Service in Russian 1800 GMT 4 Oct

[Report on 4 October Paris news conference given by French President Francois Mitterand and CPSU General Secretary Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev; from the "vremya" newscast; Mitterrand speaks in French with superimposed Russian translation unless otherwise noted -- recorded]

[text] [announcer] Today Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev and Francois Mitterrand held a joint press conference. The press conference was opened by Francois Mitterrand. [Video shows Gorbachev and Mitterrand seated at table]

[Mitterrand in French, fading into superimposed Russian report in his remarks.] In his speech, the French president gave high marks to the constructive nature and atmosphere of frankness and trust in which the Soviet-French summit talks were being held.

I consider, he said, that we have moved forward in the matter of mutual understanding. The president expressed the hope that the Soviet-French summit meeting would make an important contribution to the solution of the difficult problems facing the world today.

Speaking of the questions and problems constituting the main content of the talks, Francois Mitterrand named first and foremost the problem of disarmament. Mutual disarmament and equilibrium in arms, he stressed, is a most important condition for the maintenance of peace and is the way to make it possible to avoid the danger of war breaking out. Francois Mitterand said the new Soviet proposal on the reduction of all strategic weapons by 50 percent had been received in France with great interest. The USSR and the United States should discuss that proposal, the president said. For this they have every opportunity; the experts, the corresponding figures -- in short, everything to enable them to move forward at the Geneva talks. That aim, he stressed, would also be promoted by the meeting between the General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and the U.S. President next month. Francois Mitterrand (?stressed) the direct link between the question of disarmament and the problem of transferring the arms race into space. He pointed out that France would not take part in any form of stationing weapons in space. The transfer of nuclear weapons into space, the president said, will mean not only the end of the 1972 accord on antimissile defense, but also the transition to a new spiral in the arms race, one whose results are impossible to predict. France believes, he noted, that space can and must be conquered in a different way -- for peaceful purposes. The president expressed the hope that on this question, too, the Soviet Union and the United States would come to a reasonable compromise in Geneva.

Dwelling after this on the problem of medium-range weapons in Europe, Francois Mitterand confirmed that France's policy is unchanged and France continues its independent policy in this sphere. At the same time he stressed France's desire for a balance in the nuclear forces in Europe at the lowest possible level. We are not rejecting an exchange of opinions, in particular with the Soviet Union, on this question. The dialogue which has started between us and which is continuing today appears to us to be a good method.

Speaking further on bilateral relations, Francois Mitterand spoke in favor of the development in every possible way of Franco-Soviet links in all spheres -- economic, trade, social, cultural, scientific, technological, and others. He stressed in particular the fruitfulness and promising nature of cooperation between the two countries in the peaceful conquest of space and research in the sphere of controlled nuclear fission. After this, going over to the problem of regional conflicts, Francois Mitterrand said that France was ready to promote the soonest possible solution of those conflicts, and he stressed in particular the need for talks on the Middle East with the participation of all interested sides. In conclusion, Francois Mitterand conveyed greetings to the Soviet people, stressing that it was thanks to their sacrifices during the Second World War that the liberation of France was possible.

[announcer] Then Francois Mitterrand gave the floor to Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev.

[Gorbachev] Mr President, it appears I take over where you left off. I return to the matter of why, for what purpose, we came to France. We in the Soviet Union proceed from the premise that the present situation in the world is at such a stage in its development where responsible decisions and responsible actions are needed, above all on the part of those countries whose international weight is enormous. I have in mind both the Soviet Union and the United States, as well as France, Britain, and other countries. Apparently the realities of the world today are such that we shall be able to build a better new world, and ensure progress and the strengthening of the idea of improving the world situation, if this becomes our common cause.

For all the differences in our political systems, ideologies, outlooks and traditions, we clearly all stand before the need, the crucial responsible need, to seek a way to a better world, one which would be characterized both by dialogue and by mutual understanding, and by trust and cooperation. At any rate, we in the Soviet leadership believe there is tremendous simple common sense in this: We must live in the real world, learn to live in the real world.

France is a very important partner for the Soviet Union in discussing these questions. First, there is a tradition, great traditions; This is nourishing our relations today, and something, I hope, which will always nourish our relations in the future. Speaking of tradition, in this case I do not only mean contacts of political nature, on the level of the state leadership; I mean, first of all, something which has united our peoples for many decades and centuries; it is that durable basis which has always enabled Russia and France -- the Soviet Union -- in the most difficult periods in development of the human history, to meet and to discuss the most burning, the most vitally important problems, to conduct a search for solutions to these problems. We had been proceeding from this very assumption, when we accepted the President's invitation to visit France, and this is exactly why I am visiting France and once more want to cordially thank you for that, Mr President.

Neither Mr President nor I had sent such tasks in order to change each other's faith in the course of the visit. But does the fact that we belong to different systems and military and political organizations really diminish the significance of the dialogue in which the Soviet Union and France, the general secretary and the president, are engaged? I think perhaps, in a way, even that has its own advantages -- and this is also what Mr President told you while describing the conversations which have been held. There have been many of them in the last few days. We have had three face to face meetings with the president, not to mention other conversations and meetings in the course of realization of the visit's program. We have also held meetings with other French political figures -- I should think that is the most important thing. And it seems to me that this idea we have in common with the president -- that we, the leaders of the Soviet Union and France have managed to rise up and get an overview of the processes going on in the world, to compare our assessments and views, to exchange opinions concerning the possible contributions by the Soviet Union and France to bringing about a change for the better in the world events, in the international situation -- this, I think, is evidence of the existence of a feeling of responsibility on the part of both the Soviet leadership and the French leadership for the destiny of the world. And this -- I think you will agree gentlemen, friends -- is by no means unimportant in order to be able to conduct a dialogue, and to outline ways for joint actions, parallel actions, interdependent actions, but in this very spirit, in the spirit of improving the situation in the world.

On the whole, we place a high value on the conversations which have taken place over the last few days with President Mitterrand and other French statesmen and politicians. I would describe them as being substantive [soderzhatelnyy]; they were distinguished by their constructive spirit; they were essentially open, being conducted in an open manner and in the spirit of mutual respect and good will.

Speaking briefly for my own part -- for th president has already touched upon the problems of the conversations that took place -- I would say that our conversations centered on the most urgent problems of the present dangerous international situation. Some wholly understandably differences in approach to a number of specific issues exist between us, as we discovered during the talks; but mutual understanding emerged on the necessity to do everything possible to improve the situation, to remove the threat hanging over the world, and to turn events and situations from confrontation to an improvement and to a relaxation of tension.

Mr President said that this word relaxation existed among us, and not just as a recollection of the past.

No, I would say that it seemed to me that this looked like more than a recollection, rather a definite lesson from the period of relaxation of tension.

We shall not now get involved in the reasons why this process was interrupted; but after living through a number of years when the process of detente has been to some extent strongly undermined and weakened we have all of us felt, including yourselves, that there is nevertheless a real need, if one judges things on the large scale and if one regards peace with great responsibility, to return to detente. It is precisely in this connection that detente has been mentioned here and in the course of our meetings.

I, of course agree that, as the president said, our talks were centered, as their main issue, on questions connected with the quest of how to bring an end to the unprecedented arms race that has developed. As you know, while we have been in Paris, we have informed the president, the parliament,the public, and the people of France of absolutely specific data about the proposals that we have submitted to the U.S. leadership and which have already become a subject for consideration in Geneva. These questions have taken up a lot of our time, but we do not regret this, because this is the main theme that is troubling both France and the Soviet Union and their leaders. Well, that is not saying enough; this theme is troubling all peoples and all sober-minded political leaders who have not gone crazy about the arms race, about confrontation and hostility, and these constitute a majority in the world. Naturally these were the central issues at our meetings.

I do not want to repeat the proposals; they are known to you. I should just like to say that after our exchange on these questions -- and the exchange was a very thorough one -- we heard from the French leadership and the president personally an awareness of the importance of our proposals and their constructive potential, their enormous constructive potential.

We have implemented what the Soviet leadersip has been asserting and stating for several months now -- that we are prepared for radical cuts, on the condition that space strike weapons, nuclear strike weapons, are not allowed in space. That is the essence of the problem. It corresponds to the accord, the January accord, between the foreign ministers of the Soviet Union and the United States of America.

What sustains our position on this issue? We are receiving information even now that our partners in the Geneva negotiations, several weeks and months ago said: Where are these radical proposals? And now we hear from them: Why are you being so insistent with these proposals? Because we have come to the point where we decided on these radical proposals in order to give the Geneva process a constructive character.

Perhaps we know better than others -- at least no worse than the Americans -- what awaits us if we do not stop now. And this knowledge reinforces our responsibility. Now there are political values and there are certain restrictive factors [ogranichiteli], despite all the tension in the situation. If a new stage in the arms race begins, one connected with space, I don't know whether we shall be able to hold negotiations at all in that case. How could one approach them?

Incidentally, the press, too, should become more understanding of the seriousness of the current international situation. You serve not only the editors and those who finance you, but first and foremost the people, in the same way that the politician does. Thus the general demand -- as we understand it in the Soviet Union and as we indeed feel it -- is that we must stop and think where we are, and act differently and take specific measures.

This is a simple formula, a simple scheme; but we think that it contains a feeling of responsibility for both the destiny of our own people as well as the destiny of other peoples; it contains an invitation to constructive quests, and we are ready for these.

I have been to a certain degree heartened by what I know about the results of the meeting between our foreign minister and Mr Reagan and Mr Shultz. This time, we did not hear the typical, stereotyped answer: No! propaganda! Well, perhaps they are still seeking the right arguments in order to take up that position against later. But it seems to me that common sense and realism are maturing in U.S. society as well as in U.S. political circles and Congress. It is difficult for me to speak for the United States of America, however.

Well, I share Mr Mitterrand's opinion that there are problems which directly concern the Soviet Union and the United States of America. And he, for his part, expresses the wish that all these problems be discussed in a constructive spirit, taking account, too, of the new proposals and of the forthcoming meeting so that the world process can be shifted from impasse and that headway can be made toward normalization.

We in the Soviet Union are serious about changing the world situation for the better. We have touched on the problem of medium-range missiles. We would like somehow to bring this question also out of the condition whereby it is difficult for us to get down to it and to get involved in this process. We are discussing all these problems with the U.S. side in Geneva, particularly since there are both the U.S. medium-range Pershing and cruise missiles directly in Europe. We are of the opinion -- and I said this to Mr President Mitterrand -- that in this way a new situation is being created. We have in fact never included, and do not intend to include, the French nuclear forces in the Soviet-U.S. inventory. That I have said to the president, and that I confirm publicly. That's the first thing. The second is that when we speak about discussing this problem, and now that we have submitted new proposals, the possibility perhaps arises for beginning an exchange of opinions which might subsequently at some stage lead also to talks on the question of the French and our medium-range missiles. And we proceed from the fact that we are not asking France to reduce its nuclear potential or to stop implementing its military programs. That is France's business, and it will determine its position taking into account how the whole process develops in the world. What we are saying is: let's start to talk, let's embark on negotiations, and let's start to study this problem as an interconnected one. Perhaps that would be some sort of equivalent, but at least it is an equivalent.

We have had an in-depth exchange of views. As I understand it, Mr President does not decline to continue exchange on these problems, and we are prepared for that. As for our offer on medium-range missiles, these missiles have been taken out of service. Anybody who wants to can photograph them. In a period of 2 months, we are dismantling all the structures [sooruzheniya]. Any suggestions that we transfer them to Asia are not serious. When it is a matter of reaching accord, the Soviet Union is always very serious in these matters, and I would ask you to bear that in mind.

In Asia we have as many missiles as are needed to balance the corresponding potential of the United States in that region, no more and no less. If the United States does not increase its potential, neither will we. If the situation changes for the better, we shall always react in an equivalent manner. This is the main question which has occupied us during our conversations.

I would also mention that the president and I have devoted considerable time to questions of European security. In this area we have the experience of joint efforts with France, and it is known that this experience is substantial capital which may be utilized now in order to continue the European process, based upon the Helsinki accords, and to fill it with great content, above all with a constructive approach.

You have heard the whole complex of problems which I set out yesterday, speaking in parliament on that matter. I do not wish to repeat that. The essence of the declared positions lies in the fact that both sides remain committed to the cause of developing and deepening the European process. The president mentioned this just now. Like France, we favor the implementation of the points in the Helsinki Final Act, in all its parts, and we are deeply convinced that an improvement in the atmosphere on the European Continent would be of enormous importance for the whole world. It is here that the military-political groups confront each other directly. But at the same time, the lessons are here which we draw from history, from the history of the European Continent. And here there is the legal basis, which is there to be used, in order to proceed further along this path.

The USSR and France were once cooriginators of the Stockholm Conference. We consider it time to start working out an agreement there. And in France's opinion, the opportunity exists to step up the quest in Stockholm.

President Mitterrand and I gave due attention to an examination of regional problems and the points of tension that exist in the world. In our assessment of some of these problems, there is mutual understanding between us. On others, there are differences both in analysis and in approach. But we agree on the need to extinguish these flashpoints, by political means, fully respecting the independence and sovereignty of every country. And within the framework of this exchange, we touched upon the processes in southern Africa, in the Near East, in Central America, and other problems.

We also came to Paris with the desire to give a new impulse to Soviet-French bilateral relations. What has occurred in the course of discussing these matters allows one to hope both for an intensification, or activization, of the political dialogue and of economic and trade cooperation. We have just signed an agreement on these issues. It was our judgment that in recent years economic and trade ties have accelerated -- they have doubled -- but that what we have does not correspond to the scale of the economies of our countries, the Soviet Union and France. For this reason, we came to an agreement to step up the search to bring more results to our relations in the sphere of trade and economic cooperation. Many concrete and interesting problems have already turned up, some of them major ones. For our part, we welcome this and we think that this will also help to improve the general situation.

We -- as I have already stressed -- have agreed to build a political dialogue, and I have asked, on behalf of the USSR Supreme Soviet, Mr President to visit our country. He will be a welcome visitor to the Soviet Union. And then, when the intervals between visits will be somewhat shorter, and there will, perhaps, be fewer problems. Although I doubt, Mr President, that there will be fewer problems, still we have already passed through a certain stage in analyzing and discussing them, so that we are able to intensify our political dialogue.

Mr President mentioned here the possibility of the further expansion of scientific-technical cooperation, and we have, among other things, exchanged opinions on one such idea. There is a project, the [word indistinct] project it is called, I think. Academician Velikhov will help me. [Gorbachev turns to Velikhov sitting alongside]

[Velikhov] Yes, TOKAMAK.

[Gorbachev] Yes, the project regarding the International TOKAMAK. Taking part in the development of this project were the Soviet Union, France, the United States of America ...

[Velikhov] Japan...

[Gorbachev] Japan, and many others. So, such a project exists and it would be interesting to ponder.

Is it not possible to develop and implement this project by joint efforts, and to provide the opportunity of leading our research in such a way as to take in hand and control thermonuclear fission and obtain an inexhaustible source of energy? What a tempting and peaceful concept, our scientists and specialists in this matter are telling me. We can carry this out successfully. We have decided to continue this exchange regarding the implementation of this concept.

In our view, we have generally had a constructive dialogue, and this thought was present in President Mitterrand's last remark. We believe that all this will serve the interests of the Soviet people and the French people, and the broad interests of the European and international security.

[Announcer] Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev once again thanked the President of France, the country's politicians and representatives of the public and all the people of France for the sentiments which they have expressed in these past few days and for the hospitality shown to the Soviet delegation.

[Mitterrand] We have been listening to Mr Gorbachev. I will also define a number of aspects of our conversations. Please ask us questions of your choice.

[Question by unidentified reporter in French with superimposed Russian translation] The question relates to the level of the French nuclear forces. Is it your wish that that level should not go up, or that it should go up moderately within the framework of the modernization of the French nuclear forces.

[Gorbachev] I take it that that question is addressed to me, yes? I think that I have spoken quite definitely on that question. We are proposing that a process of direct exchanges be started, and I think that all the specific questions could be discussed during that process. That is what I would like to add to what I have said.

[Question] Soviet television, Georgiy Zubkov. Mr President, do you think that the achievement of an international agreement preventing the arms race in space is possible?

[Mitterrand] I cannot guess the future. For a long time now arms have been constantly built up, rising like a staircase, and now their final stage -- the stage in space -- has been reached. If reason has not predominated so far, who can say for certain now that it will predominate in the future? So I am not making any forecast. I have expressed the wish, and have set forth a critical position, for an acceptable compromise from both sides that is advantageous to all. The French side wants to devote itself to peaceful research in space. France, as a power with 55 million men and women, is concerned with everything that relates to peace.

[Question in French with superimposed Russian translation] I represent a French magazine. Mr General Secretary, you said that SS-20 missiles exceeding 243 will be removed. Can you confirm this with regard to an agreement for medium-range missiles in Europe?

[Gorbachev] If I understand correctly...Well, I will reply as I understood the question. First, I confirm that there are now 243 missiles on standby alert -- a small number, and exactly the same as in June 1984. Missiles have been removed, and I have said that they can be photographed on-site. In the next 2 months the installations will be dismantled. That is as far as the European zone is concerned. Yesterday I tried to explain what the European zone is. That does not go for our countermeasures relating directly to the territory of the United States: They remain in force.

As for the further process on medium-range missiles, we have tabled a proposal on the matter of revitalizing that process in the future in order to lend a realistic direction, if you like, to the process. We have tabled a proposal to proceed directly to the drafting of an accord on this type of weapon, and at the same time to initiate a direct exchange with France and Britain on these questions.

This, we think, will give an opportunity to begin to take practical steps. We are convinced of this. We are prepared to move in this direction as far as our partners are -- I mean the Americans, and France and Britain -- as far as British and French missiles are concerned. This is already the subject of an exchange, and will be the subject of negotiations, if it is possible to begin them. I am not now posing the question categorically...I am not setting forth any categorical demands.

[Mitterrand] I myself made clear a few minutes ago that France will not refuse to exchange views with anybody -- on any point -- least of all the Soviet Union. However, I do not consider it expedient to conduct negotiations, since France does not possess such potential, not on the same scale. Furthermore, in the matter of taking our forces into account, France does not disagree with the United States when it comes to calculating equilibrium in Europe and the world. I said what had to be said about space, and France remains fully at liberty to voice its views. It is an independent country, with an autonomous strategy.

[Question in French with superimposed Russian translation] I am from British Television. Monsieur le President has just pointed out that he will conduct talks on the question of nuclear systems in France. Why do you suppose that Mrs Thatcher will be more agreeable to this than President Mitterrand? And also, will you forgive Mrs Thatcher for expelling 31 officials for espionage last month?

[Gorbachev] I will answer the first question. I believe that, with regard to what we know today of the British position on medium-range missiles, that position took shape in a certain set of conditions. Today I am inviting the president of France -- I have already done so -- and Mrs Thatcher, in writing, to adopt a new approach, in connection with the radical proposals tabled by the Soviet Union. This, after all, fundamentally changes the situation, if one takes this path.

Once you have a new situation, there must be new approaches. I agree with President Mitterrand-- we have already had time to talk about this subject -- that it would be strange if, after starting to discuss this question yesterday, we today already began negotiations and reached agreement. But at the same time, I know Mr Mitterrand's statements made earlier, before our visit, in particular during his past visit to Moscow, when, while setting forth his position on French nuclear forces, he said that France was committed to the quest for peace and the process of disarmament, but that now, first of all, the Soviet Union and the United States must make their contribution, and this by no means rules out that at some stage France will enter that process. At present, that is, I see a new situation, new opportunities are opening up. For my part, I think it was natural to invite the president to an exchange on this situation.

In answer to your second question: Every embassy of every country where it is present acts on behalf of its government. I can say that on behalf of all governments, because that is how it is: to study processes, submit information on the processes taking place in society so that there should be nothing unpredictable in relations or in mutual and international problems. Such information is, in my opinion, a natural process. All sides are involved in it. If someone wants to spoil relations and hinder the process of (?adjustment), as soon as signs emerge of some sort of international dialogue, of a thaw or seeking for such, then straightaway forces are to be found which have demands formulated by their own social class.

These forces are always at the ready; they are rapid deployment forces ready to react rapidly in order to wreck the international situation. Well, whoever it was who involved Mrs Thatcher in these affairs such that immediately, on the basis of one fact, all the representatives of the Soviet Union were, en masse, so to speak, declared to be spies, I do not know. That is their affair. We therefore proceed from the standpoint that the Soviet Union has no greater interest in relations with Britain than Britain has in relations with the Soviet Union. I repeat: We are in favor of development of relations of both political dialogue and economic relations with Britain, which is also our old partner.

[Question] GDR Television. Allow me to put a question to you, Comrade Gorbachev. Since the Second World War up to today, the Soviet Union has, I think, made more than 100 proposals for peace and disarmament. Do they still hold good?

[Gorbachev] Yes. You know, it would not be a bad thing to go back to many of the old proposals on universal and total disarmament which have been quietly shoved away in a corner somewhere like some Cinderella. This is a fundamental issue; and if we had paid attention to that issue in time, I am sure that we would not be in such a situation in the world as we are today. These kind of proposals, if they had a forward-looking [persepktivnyy] character, but did not respond to, did not look like a reaction to, a certain current process, some kind of current situation -- all these proposals of ours remain in force.

[Question in French fading to Russian translation] Netherlands Television: Mister General Secretary: Can you indicate to us the number of SS-20 missiles deployed [razmeshcheny] throughout the whole territory of the Soviet Union. You are aware that the Netherlands Government has to make a decision on November 1, and this is a determining date for us.

[Gorbachev] Your leadership has been informed of our steps. And it has the opportunity to reflect on our proposals. As far as information on how many missiles there are and what kind they are is concerned, I think that it would take up a lot of time for me to answer this question. Moreover, since this concerns Europe, and while it is still the European zone, it extends beyond the bounds of the Urals as far as the 80th parallel, so (?I cannot give you any clarity here). I think that it is sufficient for the Netherlands.

[Mitterrand] The number of hands being raised in the hall is increasing the more it seems to us that the discussion is exhausting itself. [Gorbachev laughs]

[Question from Israeli journalist in French, fading into Russian translation] Israeli radio and television: A question for Mister Gorbachev. You insisted on the need to take concrete steps for the solution of problems. In relation to the Middle East, there is one such concrete step for the Soviet Union -- the reestablishment of diplomatic relations with Israel. Do you intend to reestablish diplomatic relations, and if so, then when and under what conditions, and if otherwise, then why not?

[Gorbachev smiles; laughter in the hall] You can feel from the reaction in the hall that I do not even have to answer this question in view of its clarity with respect to my answer. I will answer all the same.

The situation in the Middle East is serious. And Mr President has already spoken about this. It arouses concern both in the Soviet Union and in France.

We will exchange views with the leadership of France to seek better solutions to this problem.

The Israeli leadership is pursuing a short-sighted policy if it wants to solve its national interests by means of separate deals. This can only bring some sort of temporary success. The question has to be solved in a fundamental way. And in a fundamental solution, in an improvement of the whole situation in the Middle East, the Soviet Union has always taken part, it will continue to take part, and will act in that direction with a sense of great responsibility in order not to let those processes get out of control. A search must be made for political approaches toward a settlement. Certain people do not have an interest in the Soviet Union's participation. But that's just the way it is: the presence of the Soviet Union in the Middle East is an objective factor. And we do not renounce our role. We favor collective efforts, and I share your thoughts, Mr. President, in that respect.

As far as the resumption of relations is concerned, I think that the sooner the situation in the Middle East is normalized, the sooner it will be possible to begin examining the question of normalizing relations. For us then there would be no obstacles. We took part in the creation of the state of Israel. We recognize the right to life -- the sovereignty -- of that state, we understand its legitimate interests and security requirements. But on how we understand all of this we have great differences: how the Israeli ruling circles understand security, and how we understand it. The process has to be carefully thought about. I'm taking the opportunity to give that advice. It is, so to speak, not an easy matter.

[indistinct question]

[Gorbachev] Perhaps you could ask the president a few more questions? [laughter from audience]

[Speaker in French with superimposed Russian translation] We don't see you as often as we see him! [laughter]

[Speaker in English with superimposed Russian translation] Thank you Mr. General Secretary, I represent American CBS television. I should like to follow up the question by my colleague from Israel. First of all, why do you not allow all the Jews who want to emigrate from the Soviet Union to do so? Can you tell us how many political prisoners there are in the Soviet Union?

[Gorbachev] I answered those questions in my interview for French television. I have nothing to add.

[Speaker in Russian] Jacqueline Dubois, of French television. Mikhail Sergeyevich, I speak Russian and I work for the first program of French Television. In your speech yesterday you said that the world economy and technological progress require an exchange of people and ideas. Is there any plan in your country in the near future to open the doors of the Soviet Union a little wider and enable the Soviet people to come to the West completely freely, and thus help people from the West to come to the Soviet Union?

[Gorbachev] We believe that the Helsinki process embraces all problems, including humanitarian ones, the exchange of ideas, the exchange of information and the exchange of tourism, and we support all that to the full. And I think that the more the situation improves, the broader the contacts will be. Of course, on the other hand the broader the contacts, the faster the situation will improve. In any case, unless it is connected -- as was said in Helsinki -- with using this for political purposes, for provocative purposes, to poison things and interfere in internal affairs, then in this sense the doors are now open for everyone.

There was a group of Americans who decided to take a trip on the Volga. They came from all sorts of towns throughout the country. In fact, I found out later, when they had returned to America and were sharing their impressions of their trip -- two ships, I think, with Americans on board, they travelled the whole Volga, through all the towns -- and you know what they said? Everything that we knew about the Soviet Union was nonsense. But what we saw in the Soviet Union, the people and what the Soviet Union in fact is, convinces us that they are the same people as we , with the same aims, thoughts, friendliness, aspirations and so on.

So if certain centers -- I won't here (pauses) -- will not use all these channels of human exchange, in which all people certainly have an interest, and will not introduce an element poisoning and undermining relations, particularly as far as interference in internal affairs is concerned...no [as heard] The Soviet Union, only on an equal basis, will not allow it. The Soviet Union cannot be spoken to the way some people allow themselves to speak to dozens of states and governments with no respect for them at all. The Soviet Union will put anyone in his place if necessary.

[Speaker in French with superimposed translation] Radio Canada. Mr General Secretary, is the Soviet Union able to help its citizens who are held hostage, or are they just as helpless as the representatives of Western countries?

[Gorbachev] I don't think in fact that there are any grounds for saying they are helpless. The influence of the Soviet Union and other countries, including France, where we are now, is in all cases enormous, including in this one.

I would only say that we are resolutely opposed to such methods. This is unacceptable, and we have categorically expressed our opinion in this regard. We have now put into action everything at our disposal in order to find a solution to this matter. I think that people embarking on this path will not achieve their aim.

[Question] Russian GDR Radio correspondent in Moscow. I also have a question for the CPSU General Secretary. Excuse me! [presumably apologizing for his poor Russian delivery] You have said a very great deal here in Paris about the nonmilitarization of space. Regarding peaceful cooperation in space, are there new concrete plans for joint space flights like those 3 years ago? Did you speak of this?

[Gorbachev] Yes, we shall be continuing our cooperation with France in this area. We have had fine experience in this regard. We even, perhaps, were thinking about the further carrying out of a joint flight by our consmonauts, when I had my exchanges with the president. We support the idea of the peaceful use and conquest of space, and in this regard great successes can be achieved. I think you know about our proposals at the United Nations in this connection, namely, that such an organization be set up and it be situated, oh, in Paris, and that the peaceful exploration of space be developed.

[Question in English, with superimposed Russian translation] Mr General Secretary, Walter Rodgers, I represent American television in Moscow. You say that there is an element of political demgogury in the American reaction to your proposals on limiting armaments. Are you ascribing this political demagoguery to President Reagan, or to someone else? Who is responsible for this political demagoguery? Do your pronouncements not contradict your statement to TIME Magazine?

[This question is heard in English as follows: I would like to ask you, please sir: Your remarks this morning seemed to suggest that there was an element of political demagoguery in the American reaction to the arms control proposals, which you have just unveiled.

First, are you assigning that political demagoguery to President Reagan, and, if not, wherein lies the political demagoguery? And, secondly, sir, would you be so kind as to tell us that by raising the issue of political demagoguery aren't you rather contradicting your remarks in TIME magazine that it was time to lower the rhetoric going into the Geneva summit?]

[Gorbachev] I should like also to confirm now all that I said in the interview given to the TIME magazine representatives, and I should like to say straightaway that in that remark that I made on the basis of the information that had reached me it would be very irresponsible for my part, if on this occasion, someone who had been attempting to undertake serious and constructive steps were to transfer everything back as it were to the level of a propaganda shooting match. That would be irresponsible. As for Mr Reagan's position, I have indeed said that for the first time we -- and this was said by Comrade Shevardnadze, the minister of foreign affairs, who is here -- sensed in the conversation on the part of the President and those who took part -- I have in mind Mr Shultz, Mr McFarlane and others -- we sensed a serious attitude from them toward our proposals. We hope that this will be the case in actual fact. We do not want to damage the security of the United States of America. That does not enter our plans. We do not want to outplay the United States of America, and we do not advise the United States of America to do so.

[Moderator, in French with superimposed Russian translation] Ladies and Gentlemen, I shall give the floor to a few more journalists, but, you know, it is necessary to bring this to an end. It is difficult to choose between you. If you please, madame!

[Question in English with superimposed Russian translation] Heather Pick, of the LONDON GUARDIAN. Are you holding talks on reducing strategic armaments? Do they envisage the possibility of an agreement on the nondeployment of space weapons, or do you consider that these two issues are separate? To what extent will you agree with President Reagan on the outlines for the future talks in Geneva, when you meet him there?

[Gorbachev] Well, I do not think we should anticipate the Geneva meeting at this press conference. It is a serious matter, after all, and we, and I think the American side, understands this, and are making appropriate preparations. As for the specific part of your question, I will say this: that we must come to agreement on the nonmilitarization of space and on the radical curtailment of strategic nuclear weapons on earth.

[Speaker in French with superimposed Russian translation] We have a few moments left. Please be so good as to ask your questions.

[Speaker in English with superimposed Russian translation] Mr General Secretary, so there is no readiness for negotiations on medium-range missiles? Why not?

[Above translation was heard in English as follows: (?Teleglobe, Brazil) Secretary General, Mr Mitterrand was quite [words indistinct] that he is not prepared to enter negotiations with the Soviet Union on middle-range missiles. You don't seem to take the rebuff, though. Why is that?]

[Gorbachev] On the contrary, I think, as I said, on the contrary, that our proposals create new situations making it possible to extricate this issue and start this process. I do not understand why you have formed such an impression after both my speech and my replies. I insist precisely on the fact that with our steps we, so to speak, are moving this process along and putting movement into it, starting to move from deadlock. Opportunities are opening up both with the Americans and with France and Britain.

[Speaker in French with superimposed Russian translation] The countries of the Near East are awaiting your meeting with Reagan and the results of that meeting with some concern. What place does thi region occupy in your priorities? And what will the situation be if the American delegation refuses to talk to you about the destiny of the region, which it considers to be in its sphere of interest? A second question: We know your position on the Arab territories occupied by Israel. But what will happen if Syria takes up arms? Will you come out in favor of implementation of the Un resolution? What will your position be?

[Gorbachev] We are concerned at everything that is happening in the Near East. And we have never stood aside from the process of seeking for a settlement of the Near East situation on a just basis. This means that the troops must be withdrawn from the occupied territories; the Palestinian problem must be resolved on the basis of self-determination; the indivisibility of Lebanon must be secured, as must its peaceful development, and as, also, must the legitimate rights of the Israeli people and the Israeli state. It is in this direction that solution must be found. Other approaches, I think, toward finding solutions by means of separate deals and, roundabout maneuvers can only, perhaps, lead to some sort of temporary settlement. But this will not give any solution of the problem so as to establish a firm peace in the Near East. Therefore collective efforts in the search for genuinely realistic ways out of this situation are needed.

As for the Americans considering it their sphere of interest, as you say, the Americans say all sorts of things. The Americans declare their vital interests to lie in this region, and vital interests in that region [as heard] -- let theAmericans reflect on the wording. Incidentally, this is one of the premises giving rise to misunderstandings and acute situations between us: if everything around, everything in the world is declared the territory of one's vital interests, what is left for other peoples? For 200 states? The position of vassals? But this does not correspond to the concept of equal development of peoples and the sovereign opportunities for each people to realize their own sovereign rights aNdmake their own choice. All the more so, gentlemen, in that this process always proceeds painfully. We do not conceal our positions. When this or that country and people chooses the path of progressive transformations and aspire to work out their own independent policy and formulate their understanding in the spiritual sphere, establish their own economic institutions -- we welcome this. We are on the side of these peoples.

When we say this, they then say -- the hand of Moscow. The hand of Moscow! Well, and what if I were to ask each of you, in this case, in this situation, would you, would you really take up any different position? And to answer the last part of your question: we are in a very changeable and varied world in terms of political and cultural and economic development, of the degree of development. Where international relations are concerned, we should take every step with great responsibility. It is impermissible to proceed from such imperial ideas. I relate this to the Soviet Union, too: and we have never permitted this and will not do so.

I suppose I should take this off now [reference to headphones]

[Announcer] President Mitterrand thanked Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev and the journalists for taking part in the press conference.

Visits Peugeot Plant

LD041526 Moscow TASS in English 1517 GMT 4 Oct 85

[Text] Paris, October 4 TASS -- This afternoon Mikhail Gorbachev visited an auto works of the "Peugeot" company in Poissy, a town near Paris. Cars of this firm are known both in France and beyond it.

Mikhail Gorbachev visited the production shop where car bodies are assembled. Officials of the firm and the plant told him about the modernisation of the enterprise as a result of which highly-productive modern equipment could be installed without expanding the old production area. Mikhail Gorbachev showed interest in the work of flexible technological lines fitted out with robots. A thousand "Peugeot" cars of three models are put out here every day.

Jacques Calvet, president of "Peugeot-Citroen", declared for the development of business contacts with Soviet enterprises and organisations.

During his visit to the plant Mikhail Gorbachev was accompanied by the French minister of Restructuring Industry and Foreign Trade, Edith Cresson.

Greets PCF at Lenin Museum

LD042121 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1927 GMT 4 Oct 85

[Text] Paris, 4 October (TASS) -- The workers of France preserve carefully the memory of V.I. Lenin's visit to their country. Many Parisians know the (Marie-Rose) street. On the outside of Number 4 is a Bas-relief of V.I. Lenin and the words:

"V.I. Lenin lived in this house from 6 July 1909 to 12 June 1912."

The French Communist Party [PCF], in connection with the CPSU Central Committee Institute of Marxism-Leninism established a museum in the third-floor apartment here, which was opened in April 1955. The French Communists have done everything to see that visitors can get a complete idea of the life and activity of the great leader of the world proletariat.

The V.I. Lenin Museum was visited today by Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee. The French Communists, and workers who gathered here, welcomed him cordially. Hundreds of voices chanted together: "Long live the Soviet Union!" "Long live the PCF and the CPSU!"

Mikhail Gorbachev was met by Georges Marchais, general secretary of the CP, and Claude Billard, Pierre Blotin, Madeline Vincent, Jean-Claude Gayssot, Francette Lazard, Paul Laurent, Gisele Moreau, Gaston Plissonnier, and Philippe Herzong, and PCF Politburo members.

Mikhail Gorbachev was told the history of the museum and about its exhibits by (J. Loriguet), PCF member and a museum patron. The general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee looked round Lenin's apartment with great interest, which in 1909-1912 was a real headquarters for Russian revolutionaries. He looked at documents, photographs, and engravings which told about V.I. Lenin's Parisian period and the history of the CPSU and the PCF. From Lenin's study, Mikhail Gorbachev and Georges Marchais came out onto the balcony. The emissaries of working Paris greeted them with warm applause.

Addressing the crowd, Georges Marchais said: "The fact that you are here today shows that you are well disposed toward cooperation between France and the USSR. I am sure that for many of you, this symbolizes the solidarity that unites the PCF and the CPSU. On behalf, of all of you, I greet Mikhail Gorbachev, and say to him: Welcome!"

The general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee came to the microphone. He said: "Dear Friends! I thank you cordially for coming here. I take this as an expression of your feelings toward the Soviet people and toward the CPSU; as an expression of the fraternal relations between our peoples and our parties.

We consider our visit to France to be a very important event. At a time when many difficult questions and problems have accumulated in the world, and when the efforts of many peoples are required, we naturally depend on such a reliable partner as we have in France and the French people. Through you, I greet the French people. I bring you warm greetings from the Soviet people."

The words of Mikhail Gorbachev and Georges Marchais were greeted with warm and prolonged applause. Mikhail Gorbachev presented to the museum, graphics by Petr Belosov dealing with Lenin's life and work in France; letters, issues of the newspapers SOTSIAL-DEMOKRAT and PROLETARIY containing articles by Lenin published in 1909-11; and a selection of books by Lenin in foreign languages.

The general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee wrote the following in the visitors' book: "My visit to the museum in Rue (Marie-Rose) fills me with gratitude to the French who cherish the memory of a man dear to us, Vladimir Ilich Lenin -- from whom we have all learned, are learning, and will continue to learn."

Gorbachev Hosts Dinner 4 Oct

LD042120 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 2030 GMT 4 Oct 85

[Text] Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev gave a dinner today to mark his official visit to France. The dinner was attended on the French side by Mitterrand, the French Republic's president; Fabius, the prime minister; Mermaz, president of the National Assembly; Poher, president of the Senate; members of the government; eminent politicians and public figures; and representatives of business, scientific and cultural circles; and, on the Soviet side, by the officials taking part in the visit; Vorontsov, the USSR's ambassador to France; and staff members of Soviet institutions in France.

Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev and Francois Mitterrand made speeches at the dinner. Their speeches were listened to attentively and greeted with applause. The dinner took place in a friendly atmosphere.

Gorbachev Dinner Speech

LD050023 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 2104 GMT 4 Oct 85

[Text] The visit to France by Comrade Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, member of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, is continuing. Yesterday, [4 October], Comrade Gorbachev gave a dinner on the occasion of his visit.

We are broadcasting Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev's speech at this dinner:

Esteemed French guests, comrades, we are glad to welcome the president of the Republic of France and his spouse, prominent French state, political and public figures, and representatives of culture and art, and businessmen, to the Soviet Embassy.

On the eve of my departure from Paris, I would like first of all to say some words of gratitude. My wife and I, and all our comrades, have been touched by the hospitality shown us on French soil. We attribute the signs of attention which have accompanied our stay to the friendly feelings of the French people for the Soviet people. You may rest assured that these feelings are mutual. The traditional [stimpatiya] feeling of the Soviet and French peoples for each other, places its permanent, fruitful imprint on the whole development of relations between our states. In setting out for France, we prepared ourselves for open discussion of any question which might be raised by either side, taking account not only of what draws us together, but also what divides us. Our meetings and conversations with the president of the Republic, the prime minister, and parliamentarians of various political parties were held precisely thus, in a business-like spirit of commitment [zainteresovannyy dukh]. I believe that, on the whole, we understand each other better.

As for the essence of the talks, we have already spoken of this today at our joint news conference. I will select the main point. In our view, a major step was made in Soviet-French cooperation in various fields, above all the political field, and this cooperation will be to no ones detriment; not to Europeans, Americans, nor to Third World countries.

It is with pleasure that I carry out the instruction of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium to invite you, Mr President, on an official visit to the Soviet Union. Our countries are again arranging the practice of regular, almost yearly, meetings at summit level, so we will gladly receive the president of France in the Soviet Union next year. Working visits at summit level are also possible of course, if circumstances demand it.

We have agreed on more systematic contacts at various levels and through various channels. We already have put in practice active consultations on foreign political problems. That is good; and this useful practice should be strengthened and developed. We have also accumulated rich, and in some cases, unique experience in business cooperation. We have agreed to instruct our departments to activate further their contacts and widen liaison in this area. I hear that you have a saying: "impossible" is not a French word. That attitude impresses us. Let us start from the premise that, in our cooperation, nothing is impossible beforehand. I think our talks will evoke a response not only at the level of bilateral relations. After all, the international problems that have been discussed are of urgent concern not only to Soviet and French people.

I will venture to express the opinion that, as a result of the Soviet-French meeting, it has become clearer to both sides which paths we should move toward in smoothing-out international relations, restraining the arms race and removing nuclear weapons. In the past, the Soviet Union and France have repeatedly initiated positive changes in the international arena. And it seems to us that today, too, we have a common understanding of the need for serious efforts to promote a revival of detente and a strengthening of trust.

I would hope that the USSR and France will be a good example on this matter. And if La Rochefoucald, one of the outstanding minds of France, is to be believed, there is nothing as infectious as an example.

Further, our talks confirmed the closeness of our approach to one of the cardinal questions of the international situation today: the prevention of an arms race in space. Both countries are ready to keep space for peaceful activities, for the good of all states.

In these very days the first congress of the international public organization of cosmonauts and astronauts in taking place in France. Participating in it are Soviet, American and French cosmonauts -- that is, people who know space first hand, and they also come out firmly in favor of space being peaceful.

We are in favor of scientific research, of developing and using the latest technology, including that for the peaceful mastering of space. Not only that, we, as is known, have made proposals to the United Nations on the organization of international cooperation to this end.

We have already spoken with you, Mr President, about yet another sphere of possible cooperation. I am speaking of the creation of a thermonuclear reactor for obtaining electric power, by the united efforts of a number of countries. A scientific basis for that has already been created as a result of the work of scientists from the USSR, United States of America, West Europe and Japan, on the basis of ideas advanced by Soviet scientists. I think that the initiatives of the Soviet Union and France on this account would be met with approval by the world. It is a matter of great importance to all peoples, and is exclusively peaceful: providing mankind with an inexhaustible source of energy.

On a wide complex of European affairs we also noted a similarity of views between the USSR and France. Both countries, like other states whose signature stands on the Helsinki Final Act, are for the continuation and deepening of the general European process. We agreed on several concrete steps aimed at making the work of the Stockholm conference on measures to strengthen confidence, security and disarmament in Europe more productive, and bring the business more energetically to a successful completion.

Today the necessity is clearly felt for more active mutual action by interested states to extinguish foci of conflicts and tensions which exist in different areas. It appears that there is a substantial similarity between the USSR and French views on this score. We are prepared to continue further our exchange of views and our consultations in depth, and to seek ways to cooperate and to unblock the paths to finding reasonable solutions.

In a word, President Mitterrand and I have carried further -- to my mind, usefully -- a specific [predmetnyy] and purposeful dialogue, with the aim of promoting a radical improvement in the international climate and giving a new impetus in this respect.

On the whole, I believe we have grounds to feel a certain satisfaction with the results of our talks. Permit me, Mr President, to wish you and your wife and all French representatives good health and good fortune. May Soviet-French relations become stronger and develop for the well-being of our peoples and in the interests of European and international security.

Mitterrand Diner Speech

LD050255 Moscow TASS in English 0240 GMT 5 Oct 85

[Text] Paris, October 4 TASS -- Francois Mitterrand, president of the French Republic, said at a dinner given by Mikahil Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and a member of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet, on Friday [4 Oct], on the occasion of his official visit to France:

Mr General Secretary: Your official visit is drawing to a close. We were very busy during three days and, I think, busy with a useful matter. That is why I ask myself the question: What will I do tomorrow without you? You mentioned some highlights of the contents of our conversations.

I will not dwell on what was most substantial. It has already been said. But it is true that nothing useful, nothing important can be achieved in conversation if they do not pass an an atmosphere making it possible to say yes, making it possible to say no and especially making it possible to meet anew.

You have already done a good deal, Mr. General Secretary, at the helm of a great and powerful country. It is good that we Frenchmen living at the other end of Europe have been able to realize what the Soviet leaders are like and how they approach the solution of fundamental problems. You have managed to touch upon concrete problems, to discuss matters of principle and to map out ways to the future. All this has helped us better to understand you. And this night I want to express satisfaction with the fact that we have made each other's acquaintance. So next year I will go to Moscow by the road which has already been travelled.

I think it is useful to restore traditions so that there should not be too much time elapsing between meetings because silence and ignorance, as we often see, breed misunderstanding.

They say that politics is a complex business. But I can put it in a general form in three simple ideas: I believe in history, in geography, in culture. I believe in history because it was no change that way back in the Middle Ages, French kings took interest in those who will building in Kiev what eventually became your great power.

I often recollect that in 1492 navigators reached the shores of America, and America became part of world history. In the same year ambassadors of the Moscow Principality presented their credentials in Venice and Florence. The two great powers of today made their appearance in history simultaneously. Is it chance or destiny? I do not know. World history travels by the same paths, though nowadays it also is making new paths, those in space. But our history always goes by the same paths, by the paths of Russia, the paths of the Soviet Union, which cross with the paths of France. And these paths very seldom were at odds.

Since we are at the two opposite ends of Europe, we should discuss problems together and look together for solutions to problems sometimes created by others. You know and we know that we and you belong to different systems of thinking. This is indubitable. But both you and we are living in Europe. Civilization and culture speak a common tongue.

We surmounted two contradictions which were tragic for the first half of this century. We achieved reconciliation with Germany and established a community of European countries which are very dissimilar but which have a common cultural background, which I mentioned earier. This culture should enable Europe to cross borders for dialogue and communication. We must have a common tongue. I wish very much that the two parts of Europe could restore enough effective ties between them, that your and our common Europe should find a definite way to communicate, work, make exchanges and live on our planet.

We were very glad to spend these three days with you for the good of our countries, for the good of our common cause. We of course have to remain vigilant and to take care about the interests of our countries but we should mostly take care about the most important thing, the cause of world peace.

I wish you a happy trip back home, success in your work, and success to the peoples of the Soviet Union.

Meets PCF'S Marchais 5 Oct

LD051026 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1000 GMT 5 Oct 85

[Text] A meeting was held today in Paris between Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, CPSU Central Committee general secretary, and Geroges Marchais, general secretary of the French Communist Party. [PCF] During the discussion, which was held in an atmosphere of fraternal friendhsip, Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev spoke on the results of the Franco-Soviet summit talks. Georges Marchais once again confirmed the French Communist' profound belief, expressed in the CPSU-PCF joint statement, that the development and deepening of Franco-Soviet relations and the utilization of all existing resources in this respect, meets the French people's vital interests.

Both sides are of the opinion that any steps forward along the path of reducing confrontation, limiting the arms race, and returning to detente, deserve the utmost support from the working class and the entire democratic and peace-loving public.

Comrade Shevardnadze, CPSU Central Committee Politburo member, Comrades Aleksandrov, Zagladin, and Zayatin, CPSU Central Committee members, and Gremetz, member of the Politburo and secretary of the PCF central committee, participated in the meeting.

FURTHER REPORTAGE, STATEMENTS ON BEIRUT HOSTAGES

New Conditions for Release

JN070656 Paris Radio Monte Carlo in Arabic 0605 GMT 7 Oct 85

[Text] An unknown person claiming to be speaking on behalf of the Islamic Liberation Organization which has claimed responsibility for the kidnapping of the four Soviet citizens and for killing one of them, stated that the organization will not release the three Soviets before agreement is reached between the USSR and the United States on ending the war in Lebanon. The unknown spokesman added that not a single Soviet, U.S., or European hostage should be released if Gorbachev and Reagan, during their forthcoming summit meeting in Geneva in November, do not reach agreement on ending the Lebanese ordeal and the Lebanese people's sufferings.

Regarding the U.S. and French hostages, the spokesman said that his organization had asked the Islamic Jihad Organization not to release them before these demands are met.

The Islamic Liberation Organization had set the halting of attacks against the Islamic Unification Movement in Tripoli as a condition for the release of the Soviet diplomats. However, the spokesman for the organization announced last night that halting the attack against Tripoli is no longer sufficient and that the release of the Soviet hostages will not be easy to achieve. He even threatened that further kidnappings will take place.

Birri Meets Soviet Envoy

NC051208 Beirut Domestic Service in Arabic 1045 GMT 5 Oct 85

[Excerpt] Nabih Birri, minister of state for the south and reconstruction affairs, and Soviet Charge d'Affaires Yuriy Suslikov met again to discuss the issue of the kidnapped Soviet diplomats. After the meeting, the Soviet charge d'affaires said: The meeting was held to discuss the kidnapped Soviet diplomats. Asked what the Soviet Union's stand will be if the issue is protracted, he replied: You can read the Soviet Government's statement.

Sources at the U.S. and Soviet Embassies said today that they have no information about the fate of the three kidnapped Soviet officials or the U.S. diplomat. It has been learned from a source close to the Soviet Embassy that the wives of two of the four Soviet diplomats kidnapped last Monday have decided to remain in Beirut.

Moscow TV Review

LD061824 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1500 GMT 6 Oct 85

[From the "International Panorama" program presented by Stanislav Kondrashov]

[Text] A number of the week's events were connected with the Near East. One of them tragically concerned our country. On 30 September, four Soviet citizens -- three staff members of our Embassy and one staff member of the trade delegation -- were captured on the streets of Beirut. The abduction was carried out in two places almost simultaneously. The Islamic Liberation Organization, as it calls itself, claimed responsibility for this act. This organization belongs to extremist Muslim groupings.

Having abducted our people, the terrorists are in some way trying to use them as hostages. As a condition for their release, they have put forward demands regarding the actions of Lebanese groups which are at odds with each other and which are by force of arms fighting for control over Tripoli, the second largest town in Lebanon. The Soviet Union has nothing at all to do with this new Lebanese internal strife, as is also stressed in the special statement by the Soviet Government.

Meanwhile, events have taken a tragic turn. On 2 October, one of the captured Soviet citizens, Arkadiy Valeriyevich Katkov, was killed by the terrorists. The innocent victim, a young staff member of the Soviet Embassy in Beirut, had been sent to this turbulent country in order to fulfill his official duties in a conscientious and benevolent manner toward the Lebanese.

Arkadiy Katkov had not yet turned 32. He was born in Krasnodar Kray. He studied, worked, served 2 years in the Army, then worked again as a mechanic at the Krasnodar china and earthenware establishment. In 1976, he entered the Moscow State Institute of International Relations, from which he successfully graduated in 1982. A talented Arabist, he was sent to the Soviet Embassy in Beirut in March 1983.

Arkadiy Katkov leaves behind a wife and a little 4-year-old daughter, his mother, and relatives. We express our sincere and profound condolences to them. Our country does not forget its citizens who perish abroad while fulfilling their official duty.

All efforts are being made to obtain the immediate and unconditional release of the rest of our people who were abducted.

The statement of the Soviet Government puts the blame on the immediate organizers and executors of this heinous action and at the same time points to the responsibility of those who could cut short these criminal actions, blocking reprisals against Soviet people, but who fail to do so. The statement also stresses that Israel is the prime cause of internal Lebanese strife.

Defense Measures Discussed

LD051401 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1600 GMT 4 Oct 85

[Text] The kidnapping of four Soviet citizens and the murder of one of them has caused a wave of indignation in Lebanon. Lebanese President al-Jumayyil has held a meeting with the army command and leadership of the security services. They discussed measures to step up the defense of Soviet institutions in Beirut.

Youth Group Statement

LD061237 Moscow TASS in English 1144 GMT 6 Oct 85

[Text] Budapest, October 6 TASS -- The criminal abduction of Soviet citizens in Beirut has been a consequence of the Israeli occupation of Lebanon and the aggressor's incessant attempts to stoke up internecine strife with a view to establishing its domination, the bureau of the World Federation of Democratic Youth (WFDY) said in a statement here.

The act of terrorism has been directed against the Soviet Union, a country pressing for a peaceful solution to the Middle East conflict, it remarked, adding that the crime, which has led to the death of one of the kidnapped Soviet citizens, has been another attempt to aggravate the situation in the region.

The WFDY strongly condemned the provocative act of terrorism against the Soviet citizens and demanded their immediate and unconditional release.

Red Cross Statement

LD050940 Moscow TASS in English 0910 GMT 5 Oct 85

[Text] Moscow, October 5 TASS -- The Executive Committee of the Union of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies of the USSR has issued a statement, strongly denouncing the September 30 atrocity committed by an extremist Moslem group in Beirut against citizens of the Soviet Union, a country consistently standing for the unity and territorial integrity of Lebanon.

Supported by its western patron, Israel, it said, has for four decades now been breaking norms of international law with impunity and executing a policy of aggression, expansion and banditry against Arab nations, first of all the Arab people of Palestine.

The Soviet Red Cross has sent an appeal to the International Red Cross Committee asking the most urgent and vigorous measures to secure the release of the abducted Soviet citizens and provide them with the necessary humanitarian aid.

Embassy Statement

NC051501 Beirut Domestic Service in Arabic 1405 GMT 5 Oct 85

[Text] The Soviet Embassy in Beirut released a statement this afternoon expressing its deep appreciation to the various parties and organizations for their sympathy toward the Soviet Union in regard to the kidnapping of four Soviet citizens and the slaying of one of them. The embassy expersses gratitude for the role being played by the various parties in the search for the three diplomats and in the efforts to have them freed.

The statement adds: Throughout the years, the Soviet Union has been and will remain a loyal friend to the Lebanese and other Arab peoples and a solid supporter of the independence and unity of the Lebanese territory and people. The statement says: imperialist and Zionist conspiracies are the major cause for the civil war in Lebanon, which has entered its 11th year. These years show that the Lebanese, regardless of their religious or political affiliation, need to mend their differences and to join the common struggle against these two reactionary powers. The Soviet Union has stood and will always stand with the Lebanese and the other Arab peoples in this struggle.

TUNISIA SEVERS DIPLOMATIC LINKS WITH LIBYA

PM011533 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 28 Sep 85 First Edition p 5

[TASS reports under the general heading: "Diplomatic Relations Broken Off"]

[Text] Tunis, 27 Sep -- The Tunisian Government has broken off diplomatic relations with the Libyan Jamahiriyah. Prior to this decision so me Libyan diplomats were charged with activity incompatible with their status and Libya was accused of "anti-Tunisian Measures."

Tripoli, 27 Sep -- The JANA agency reports that Libya has resolutely rejected Tunisia's charges, calling them "unfounded and farfetched."

U.S. USES ARMS DELIVERIES TO 'PRESSURE' JORDAN

PM031414 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 1 Oct 85 Morning Edition p 4

[IZVESTIYA press service report: "Crude Pressure"]

[Text] U.S. President Reagan has had meetings with President Mubarak of Egypt and King Husseir of Jordan in Washington. Official U.S. Administration spokesmen and Reagan himself made no secret of their intention to exploit these talks for reviving efforts aimed at imposing separate deals with Israel on Near East countries and breathing new life into the Camp David policy.

Just before and during the meetings with the Arab leaders, high-ranking U.S. officials repeatedly declared that the United States has not changed its Near East policy, thus making it clear that it remains, like before, aimed at consolidating Tel Aviv's military-strategic positions in the region.

To put it briefly, the White House exerted direct pressure on Egypt and Jordan to ensure their more active cooperation in the implementation of U.S. "initiatives" in the Near East, which run contrary to the fundamental interests of Arab countries and the Palestinian Arab people, whose legitimate right to national self-determination and the establishment of their own independent state is denied by Washington.

The U.S. Administration is using the question of arms deliveries to Jordan as a lever for pressure on Amman. It is also bluntly said the U.S. Congress that arms deliveries will become possible only if Amman pledges firmly to recognize Israel and begin direct talks with it. Reagan himself declared in connection with these deliveries: "I remain, like before, unconditionally committed to giving aid to Israel to enable it to maintain its present decisive advantage over any combination of potential enemies. The transfer of weapons to Jordan which I propose does not threaten this policy." In other words, any comment would be superfluous.

UN MEMBERS SPEAK OUT AGAINST ISRAELI ACTIONS

LD040832 Moscow TASS in English 0615 GMT 4 Oct 85

[Text] New York, October 4 TASS — TASS correspondent V. Chernyshev reports: The Israeli bandit-style air raid on the capital of Tunisia thousands of kilometers away from Israel's border, which has left dozens of people killed or wounded and done huge material damage to the country which has come under that unprovoked cold-blooded attack, has been summed up by the international community as another link in the endless chain of Tel Aviv's crimes against Arab states and peoples.

Demands to curb the overweening aggressor at long last and to restore the peace and security in the Middle East, which are eagerly wanted by the peoples of the region, have been made by more than 30 speakers from different countries, who have already spoken at the Security Council which is continuing to discuss the situation in the wake of the latest Israeli act of aggression.

Representatives of the international community have also noted unanimously that the arrogant conduct of Israel, which has been flouting all norms of international law and civilized behavior, has been possible only due to its direct aiding and abetting by the United States. Adnan Umran, assistant secretary-general of the League of Arab States, said that as Israel had continued its crimes, it had relied on the all-round backing of the United States, which, he noted, was a permanent member of the Security Council.

Umran said the U.S. support included an American-Israeli strategic cooperation agreement, massive American military aid which had turned Israel into an enormous arsenal of latest American weapons, billions of dollars denied to the American poor so that to finance the Israeli homicides, and diplomatic backing, especially that in the Security Council. So the U.S. position, Umran said, was thoroughly hostile to the entire Arab world.

Speaking on behalf of the group of East European states, C. I. Udovenko, permanent representative of the Ukraine to the United Nations, said the piratic raid had been a violation of the fundamental norms of international law and that bound the Security Council to take the most decisive measures against Insrael in keeping with the U.N. Charter.

Hoping that the United States would protect its partner from just punishment this time again, the Israeli representative to the United Nations shook off the last restraints and told the Security Council impudently that Tel Aviv believed itself entitled to deal more blows to the Arabs in any place and at any time.

'Ali 'Abd al-Salam al-Turayki, secretary of the Supreme People's Committee of the People's Bureau for Foreign Liaison of Libya, commented that the Zionist epigone of the fascists and their American patrons wanted to impose the law of the jungle on the Middle East.

CASTRO, NYERERE HOLD TALKS IN HAVANA

LD011237 Moscow TASS in English 1121 GMT 1 Oct 85

[Text] Havana, October 1 TASS -- Cuba and Tanzania held official talks here. The delegations were led by the first secretary of the Central Committee of the Cuban Communist Party, chairman of the State Council and the Council of Ministers of the republic, Fidel Castro, and the president of the United Republic of Tanzania, chairman of the ruling Revolutionary Party, Julius Nyerere, in Cuba on an official friendly visit.

The talks, held in an atmosphere of friendship, discussed international issues, specifically, the aggravation of the situation in southern Africa. The sides condemned the apartheid policy in South Africa and acts of aggression committed by the Pretoria racist regime against neighbouring countries. They expressed support for the just struggle of the people of Namibia for independence. On behalf of the African peoples, Julius Nyerere expressed gratitude for assistance rendered by Cuba to the states of the continent which wage struggle for preserving their national sovereignty.

Topical problems of developing nations caused by the economic crisis have also come up at the talks. The sides spoke in favour of establishing a new international economic order, pointing out that the foreign debt of developing countries is a serious problem for them.

Fidel Castro and Julius Nyerere favoured the holding of the next summit meeting of non-aligned countries in the Zimbabwean capital.

STATE OF SIEGE CONTINUES IN BOLIVIA

LD032306 Moscow TASS in English 2153 GMT 3 Oct 85

[Text] La Paz, October 2 TASS -- TASS correspondent E. Abdullayev reports:

Though political tension has slightly subsided in Bolivia, the situation remains complex.

Miners and other employees of the mining industry continue their strike, universities and colleges remain closed, and not all the striking banking personnel, oilmen and industrial workers returned to their jobs. Trade union leaders exiled to remote eastern provinces have not been returned to the capital, though the authorities have promised to do so. The streets of La Paz and other cities continue to be patrolled by beefed-up police and security units, and army troops remain on alert.

The underground leadership of the Bolivian Labour Centre, the largest trade union of the country, has stated that any dialogue with the government is out of question as long as the state of siege continues and the leaders of the centre remain in exile or detention. A statement by the Mining Workers' Trade Union Federation released here points out the need to strengthen the unity of the working class and to enhance the staunchness and awareness of all the working people of Bolivia to ensure democracy in the country.

Heated debates have continued during a week in the National Congress over the authorities' decree on the introduction of the state of siege in the entire territory of the country. Deputies from the Communist Party and some other parties demand the immediate repeal of that repressive measure and the release of the exiled and arrested trade union leaders and activists.

President Victor Paz Estenssoro held secret talks with Hugo Banzer, leader of the largest opposition bourgeois party, the Nationalist Democratic Action, and secured the support of that party for the repressive measures against strikers. The Central Committee of the Communist Party of Bolivia has stated in this connection that the alliance between the government and the nationalist democratic movement is aimed at subverting democratic freedoms and suppressing the trade union movement.

DEMICHEV RECEIVES ARGENTINE CULTURE MINISTER

LD051331 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1830 GMT 4 Oct 85

[Text] Comrade Demichev, CPSU, Central Committee Politburo member, USSR minister of culture, today received Carlos Gorostiza, Argentine secretary of state for culture, who is in our country at the invitation of the USSR Writer's Union. In a conversation which passed in an atmosphere of friendship and mutual understanding, they discussed questions of the outlook for the development of cultural links between the two countries.

CPSU DELEGATION RETURNS FROM JAMAICA

PM010905 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 29 Sep 85 First edition p 5

[TASS report: "Return Home"]

[Text] A CPSU Delegation headed by Y.S. Znamenskiy, deputy of the USSR Supreme Soviet and first secretary of the Gorno-Altay CPSU Obkom, returned to Moscow from Jamaica 27 September.

The delegation had taken part in the work of the 47th Jamaican People's National Party.

TOLKUNOV MEETS WITH SURINAMESE OFFICIAL

PM271041 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 27 Sep 85 Morning Edition p 5

[TASS report: "In a Cordial Atmosphere"]

[Text] On 25 September L.N. Tulkunov, chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet's Soviet of the Union, met with Dzh. Pinas, deputy chairman of the Suriname National Assembly.

A friendly talk took place.

ACADEMICIAN COMMENTS ON INCENTIVES FOR QUALITY

PM031509 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 2 Oct 85 First Edition p 2

[Article by Academician V. Trapeznikov under the rubric "Problems and Arguments": "Once More About Quality, Technical Progress, and Incentives"]

[Text] The CPSU Central Committee April (1985) Plenum and M.S. Gorbachev's speeches have raised very acutely the question of accelerating scientific-technical progress, improving the quality of output, increasing labor productivity, and, on this basis, improving the population's living standard.

Technical progress is determined by the ability to create, on the basis of the achievements of science, new materials with previously unknown properties, new manufacturing processes, more sophisticated machinery and other articles, and the best systems and methods of control. From the consumer's viewpoint the value of the products of human labor is determined by their operational properties, that is by these products' quality.

Every article wears out and in the overwhelming majority of cases must be repaired or replaced. Unfortunately, we sometimes fail to consider that losses from stoppages and repairs sometimes exceed the cost of the article itself several times over. The raising of the reliability and lifespan of an article sharply reduces these losses, and it requires a relatively small expenditure.

Thus an increase of 10 percent in the life of automobile tires is equivalent to a 10 percent increase in their production but increases expenditure by only 0.2 percent. The transition to the production of a new type of electric lamp with a 40 percent increase in life span increases the lamps' prime cost by just 20 percent. These and many other examples show that the improvement of the quality of output is economically advantageous. Increasing the lifespan of an article is equivalent to increasing the quantity of output produced. Quality merges into quantity!

Quality is a multilevel concept and is defined by many indicators, sometimes 5, 10, or more. In our view reliability, frequently characterized by the average number of hours of an article's failure-free performance, should be put first.

Everything is in flux, everything changes, and what was good yesterday has already become obsolete today. That is why the discrepancy between the time taken for output with similar properties to appear in our country and on the markets of the technically developed countries is a graphic indicator of the standard of output, especially machine building output.

The first, most easily accessible, step on the path of improving quality, requiring no capital investments, is the raising of the discipline, attentiveness, and thoroughness of the workers and the fulfillment of the set production procedure.

There are many examples of the production of poor-quality output because of failure to observe stipulated, obvious, conditions. Thus the Armavir "Kuban" sewn goods association regularly supplies clothing with puckers, wrongly set sleeves, and so forth. Of course, this unusable output is included by the association in its report on the fulfillment of the plan.

The next step is to modernize manufacturing processes, where training and experimental units and step-by-step and outgoing control are a compulsory element. But because of the lack of good outgoing control there are instances of the production of subassemblies with faults, which disrupts the fulfillment of the consumer's plan and in addition compels his to organize a 100 percent incoming control of his own. Yet outgoing control is the duty of a conscientious producers working to fulfill the plan and not merely to report its fulfillment.

Unfortunately, strange obstacles sometimes arise on the path of the improvement of control. Thus, under existing procedure technical control section engineers are treated as administrative and managerial personnel who, as is well known, are subject to regular cutbacks. But control operations, which are becoming increasingly complex and responsible with every passing year, are an inalienable part of the manufacturing process and therefore including technical control section engineers in the administrative and managerial personnel is a blatant misjudgement.

Moreover, the technical control section chief is awarded a bonus for the same criteria as the leaders of enterprises which include the fulfillment of the volume of deliveries. Consequently, with painstaking outgoing control and the rejection of substandard output the volume of an enterprise's production may decline and the technical control section chief will receive a smaller bonus. This will scarcely encourage him to act strictly in setting up outgoing control. Obviously the technical control section personnel should be awarded bonuses on the basis of a different criterion, connected to the reduction of spoilage and the number of complaints.

The most promising and radical way of improving quality is scientific-technical progress, new manufacturing processes, new materials, and the use of scientific achievements. This premise is especially important now that we are moving toward intensification in the national economy.

Enthusiasts are taking this path but, as is well known, existing criteria for assessing the activity of enterprises (metric tons, number of items) do not direct enterprises onto the path of new technology and they hold up rather than accelerate quality growth.

We have still not elaborated keen, powerful incentives which objectively and irreversibly impel every enterprise onto the path of scientific-technical progress. Incentives are mainly based on the working people's discipline, awareness, and conscientiousness and on socialist competition and bonuses, but that is not always enough.

Perhaps in addition to other incentives it is worth introducing a kind of collective contract for the entire enterprise amounting, under the conditions of intensification, to a "13th month's wages" paid at the end of the year to the entire collective not only if the contracts concluded by the enterprise are fulfilled but also on the essential condition that particular innovations (improving the quality of output, new manufacturing processes and so forth) are introduced in the course of the year. Then the entire enterprise collective would be involved in general work to intensify production and improve the quality of output and would attentively follow all decisions made and their fulfillment.

It would be a good thing for each ministry to introduce several large bonuses to be awarded in competition to groups of people who have introduced important sceintific achievements, measures to improve quality, and new manufacturing processes with no limit on the overall annual sum of the bonuses which each recipient has the right to receive. Of course, other incentives must also be sought.

The question of incentives which accelerate scientific-technical progress in a period of keen economic rivalry between the two systems -- the socialist and capitalist -- is acquiring paramount importance. On the economic plane, not to mention moral and general human factors, the socialist system has great advantages because of the potential for in-depth strategic planning and the rapid focusing of assets on the most important salients. Its incentives, as has already been noted, are built primarly on the working people's awareness with the party's tremendous organizing influence.

But in developing economic rivalry between the two systems we should not forget the incentives operating in the capitalist system. A powerful incentive accelerating scientific-technical progress in that system is rivalry both within the country and between countries on the world markets. This rivalry leads to the "law of the jungle" -- the survival of the fittest. It intensifies the working people's exploitation. But from the viewpoint of scientific-technical progress the incentives here are very powerful: Each firm is faced with the question "to be or not to be." If a firm fails to use the achievements of science and technology, fails to keep to delivery schedules, or produces poor-quality output, the client leaves, and the firm is ruined. This law's operation is automatic. The "to be or not to be" incentive forces the firm to think intensively about new types of output and new manufacturing methods and to seek to overtake the other firm.

In our country the "to be or not to be" incentive operated at full strength for the entire people during the Great Patriotic War. It now operates in our defense industry. Indeed, under conditions where the United States is seeking to achieve military-strategic superiority, our country is compelled to take retaliatory measures and the "to be or not to be" incentive arises in all its magnitude. As a result the technology and output quality of our defense industry are far higher than in civilian fields.

It is essential to make extensive use of the experience of the defense industry workers, particularly in the sphere of quality control and the exertion of powerful influence on quality by the consumer. It is important to enhance the role of this latter factory by every means, developing the links in the "producer to consumer" system.

Alongside the improvement of existing incentives, we should seek new moral and material ones. In particular the producers of output, particularly machiner and mechanisms, which can compete successfully on world markets should be encouraged more powerfully and tangibly.

At the same time we must struggle against the "anti-incentives" which delay progress. Among these we can include levelling down and the dependent feelings which sometimes arise when the debts caused by the thriftless management of so-called "weak" enterprises are writen off.

Our system of coordinating planning and many other decision with numerous organizations-- a system which often lasts for months and sometimes even years -- is a great "anti-incentive" leading to feelings of irresponsibility.

The improvement of incentives to high output quality is an important avenue in restructuring the economic mechanism.